



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## BEL, THE CHRIST OF ANCIENT TIMES.

IT is admitted by every one who has studied the religion of the Babylonians, that it is from the first to the last *polytheistic*. If we were to take the trouble of counting together the Babylonian divinities occurring in the inscriptions and especially in the several "lists of gods," we would get nearly as many as 500-1000 different gods. This state of affairs is indeed annoying for one who tries to understand such a "theological system." The difficulty is, however, still more increased, not only by the various *identifications* of one god with another, but especially by the so-called different *genealogies* of one and the same divinity. Take, e. g., the goddess ISHTAR! She appears in one inscription as the daughter of the moon-god, *Sin*; <sup>1</sup> in another as that of the god *Anu*, <sup>2</sup> in a third as a child of *Anshar* or *Ashshur*, <sup>3</sup> in a fourth as that of *Bel*, <sup>4</sup> in a fifth as a child of *Nin-ib*, <sup>5</sup> thus being considered not only as a daughter of Bel, but also

---

<sup>1</sup> *ilu Ishtar* (SUCH) *mârat* (dumu-sal) *ilu Sin* (ESH), Ishtar's descent, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* (=K. B.) VI<sup>1</sup>. p. 80, 2 *et passim*.

<sup>2</sup> *illik mârat Anim ana pân Bêl abtsha* = the daughter of Anu went to Bêl her father. IV. R. 65, col. II. 32; Jensen, *Kosmologie*, p. 273.

<sup>3</sup> *Anshar* (= Ashshur) . . . *ba-nu-û ilâni<sup>pl</sup> mu-al-lid ilu Ish-tar* = Anshar, the creator of the gods, the begetter of Ishtar. Craig, *Religious Texts*, Vol. I. p. 32, 16.

<sup>4</sup> See note 2 above.

<sup>5</sup> As such she is known under the name *É-gà-a*, which means, according to Haupt, S. A. K. T. p. 214, 11 = *kal-la-a-tu* = "bride." *É-gà-a dumu-sag dingir IB-A*: Reisner, *Hymnen*, pp. 132, 44; 79, 14; 56, 10; IV. R. 21, No. 2, Rev. 54; Craig, R. T., I. p. 20, 28 is therefore translated by: *kal-lat mar-tum resh-ti-tum sha ilu Nin-[ib]*, i. e., "the bride, the principal daughter of Ninib," Reisner, *loc. cit.*, p. 65, 13. This latter passage proves also *dingir IB-A* is = *ilu Nin-ib*, who changes again with *dingir IB* in Zimmern, *Ritualtafeln*, No. 26, col. III. 48, 49, where *dingir IB* is called the *gash-ru bu-kur ilu Bêl* (*dingir BE*), i. e., "the mighty,

as a daughter of the first-born of Bel, for *Ninib* himself is a son of Bel.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, the divinity *ilu* *SUCH* is not only = *Ishtar*,<sup>2</sup> but also = *Ninib* himself,<sup>3</sup> nay, even = *dingir* *Lugal-banda*,<sup>4</sup> the god of Eshnunna, and husband of *dingir* *Nun-sun*, his wife. *Ishtar* is also = *An-tum*, the wife of *Anu*,<sup>5</sup> and as such = *ilu* *Nin-shar*,<sup>6</sup> who again is the "thunderbolt carrier of *Nin-Girsu*,"<sup>7</sup> or of the *É-kur*.<sup>8</sup> Yes, *Ishtar* has become even a common name for "goddess," and suffered to have a plural form "*Ishtarâte*" = goddesses.<sup>9</sup> Not very much better is it with god *NUSKU* (PA+KU). In one and the same sentence, he is called: "The one begotten by *Anu*," the "firstborn of *Enlil*," the "sprout of the ocean," the "creature of the lord of heaven and earth."<sup>10</sup>

In another inscription he appears as the "son of *É-kur*," the great one, who like *Nannar* (the moon-god) . . . busies himself with

---

the first-born of Bel." The title *kallātu*, "bride," is not only borne by (a) *Ishtar* but also by (b) *ilu* *A-a*, the *é-gi-a rabītu*, V. R. 65, 19b, who as such is identified not only with the *Ishtar* Annunit of Sippar, the wife of *Shamash*, the sun-god: V. R. 61, 5b; 40b; 65, 35a, etc., but even with *Shamash* himself: II. R. 57, 15a; (c) by *Tashmetum*, the wife of *Nabû*; IV. R. 59, 41b; Zimmern, *Shurpu*, II. 157: *kal-la-tum rabī-tum*, "the great bride." Here *Tashmetum* is mentioned in close connection with *ilu* *Na-na-a*, who in *loc. cit.* l. 156 is directly coupled with *Nabû*, while in l. 197 it is *Tashmetum* again who is mentioned with *Nabû*. Hence *Tashmetum* = *Nanâ*! (d) *Tsarpanitum*: *ilu* *Tsar-pa-ni-tum be-el-tum rabī-tum chirrat ilu* *En-bi-lu-lu ka-lat ilu* *Nu-[gim-mut]*, i. e., the great mistress, the wife of *Enbilulu* (= *Marduk*, see *Reisner, Hymnen*, pp. 53, 19; 46, 10: *umun dingir* *En-bi-lu-lu dumu-sag dingir* *En-ki-ge*; cf. also *Reisner, loc. cit.*, 138, 118), the kallat of *Nugimmut*, *Craig, R. T.*, I. p. 31, 22, cf. l. 16.

<sup>1</sup> See preceding note.

<sup>2</sup> See above note 1.

<sup>3</sup> II. R. 57b, Rev. 35: *dingir* (ti-*ish-chu*) *SUCH* = dito (i. e., *ilu* *Nin-ib*) *sha ra-am-ku-ti*, i. e., *dingir* *SUCH*, when pronounced *Tishchu*, is the god *Ninib* of "the pouring out," or better of "the washing, cleansing, himself" (*Jensen, K. B. VI*<sup>1</sup>. p. 365).

<sup>4</sup> See my forthcoming article on *Jahveh*.

<sup>5</sup> Hence his daughter and his wife!

<sup>6</sup> II. R. 54, No. 3, l. 19.

<sup>7</sup> See my *Creation Story*, (= C. S.) p. 44, note 1, and p. 46.

<sup>8</sup> *Reisner, Hymnen*, pp. 137, 44; 134, col. I. 31.

<sup>9</sup> See *Delitzsch, Handwörterbuch*, p. 154a. This is the reason why *Ishtar* may signify almost any goddess.

<sup>10</sup> *Nusku shurbû ilidî ilu* *A[nim] tamshil abi bukur ilu* *Bêl* (= *Enlil*) *tarbît apst binât ilu* *En-an-ki*: IV. R.<sup>2</sup> 49 [56], 15b, ff. See *Jensen, Kosmologie*, p. 273,

the command of the "Enlilship," who guardeth the mystery.<sup>1</sup> In a third he is called the "son of the thirtieth day of the month."<sup>2</sup> In a fourth he is designated "the great one, the one begotten by *Dur-an-ki*."<sup>3</sup> He is identified not only with Nergal,<sup>4</sup> the god of the nether world, whose "day of death" was celebrated on the twenty-eighth of a month,<sup>5</sup> but also with *dingir* *BIL-GI*, resp. *dingir* *GISH-BAR*, etc., etc.

Provoking as such genealogies might seem at the first glance, yet, we will have to admit, that they had, yes, must have had and still have a *reason*. If, therefore, we want to bring light into this chaos, we cannot do it by ridiculing<sup>6</sup> these genealogies, nor by building up, first of all, a theory of our own and then try to fit and force the different gods into our theory,<sup>7</sup> but we always and under all circumstances must maintain the accuracy of these "contradictory" genealogies and explain them by other passages of the Cuneiform Literature, which may help us to the right understanding of

<sup>1</sup> *Mār* (*dumu-ush*) *É-kur shur-bu-ú sha ki-ma* <sup>u</sup>*URU-KI-ri* (= Nannar-ri!) . . . *mut-tab-bil pa-ra-ats* <sup>u</sup>*EN-LIL-ú-ti na-tsir pi-r[is-ti]*. Craig, *Religious Texts*, I., p. 35, obv. 7, 8. Zimmern, *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* (= K. A. T.<sup>3</sup>), p. 416, note 3, wants to find in this inscription the statement that Nusku is also the son of Sin! The reading *Alidishu*, which he finds in the Rev. l. 6 f., is—at least according to Craig's copy—not justified!

<sup>2</sup> IV. R.<sup>3</sup> 23, 3 f.

<sup>3</sup> K. 3285, Bezold, *Catalogue*, p. 520: <sup>u</sup>*PA+KU shur-bu-ú i-lid-ti Dur-an-ki*.

<sup>4</sup> See *Cossæan Vocabulary*.

<sup>5</sup> IV. R. 33, 33. From these latter three references Jensen (K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. pp. 413 and 466) concludes that Nusku = Nergal, the former being the *Neumondsichel*, the latter the *abnehmender Mond*,—a conclusion which I am willing to accept with the following reserve: Nusku = Nergal is = SIN or Nin-Girsu. As Nin-Girsu was the chief messenger of Enlil, so *dingir* *Nusku lugh-magh dingir* *En-lil-lal* (E. B. H. 223, 3), i. e., "the exalted ambassador of Enlil," originally = Nin-Girsu, became, when Sin was made the highest god of the Babylonian pantheon, thus being identified with Enlil (*Creation Story*, p. 50), his (Sin's) messenger. And as the *יְהוָה מַלְאָךְ* was identified with *יְהוָה*, so was Nin-Girsu with Enlil, and Nusku or Nergal with Sin,—hence Nusku's worship in the temple of the moon-god at Harran, Inscript. of Nabû-nâ'id, K. B. III<sup>2</sup>. p. 101, col. II. 18, 42. But the messenger of a god is always his son! Hence Nusku or Nergal, the messenger of Sin, *had* to become also his (Sin's) son. The son of Sin (or ZU) is Shamash (or UD), thus it happened that Nergal (= Nusku) was said to be = Shamash, see Sp. I. 131 (*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, VI. p. 241) l. 52 ff.; Zimmern, K. A. T.<sup>3</sup>. p. 388.

<sup>6</sup> As Jensen, K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. 319, 320; *Kosm.* 273 does it.

<sup>7</sup> As is done by Barton, *Sketch of Semitic Origins*.

the nature of the god in question. If in course of such an investigation we come to understand his nature and his essence correctly, we also will and must be able to account for his genealogy, even if it were the most contradictory.

That so many different genealogies of one and the same god do exist in the religious doctrines of the Babylonians, is, no doubt, due to the various elements to be found in the Babylonian population. The little valley between the Tigris and the Euphrates was since the "dawn of history" the land which, on account of its fertility, almost all the nations of the ancient world tried to possess and actually did possess. In the inscriptions discovered in this valley we find mentioned, besides the specific Semitic-Babylonian, also Persian, Aramæan, Arabic, Hittite, Elamitic, Cossæan, Canaanitish, and Sumerian gods. A religion of the Babylonians must, therefore, be primarily a *history* of their religion; and if the investigator ignores such a historic development, his results must be pronounced, from the very first, a failure.

It is not my intention to give such a history of the Babylonian religion here—the material so far accessible to scholars would prevent me from doing this—but I want to show by a few examples that we are still able to bring some light into the chaos, if we study the religion historically.

To put it briefly, we may say that the religion of the Babylonians may be divided into three epochs:

I. *The Sumerian*, embodying in it the oldest so-called "Semitic-Babylonian" religious elements. What these latter are or were, we cannot tell as yet. It would seem, however, that the oldest Semitic religious ideas, as expressed in the inscriptions, were in all essentials and particulars the same as those of the Sumerians, i. e., the so-called Semitic-Babylonians seem to have adopted the Sumerian pantheon "in toto" without any perceptible admixture of their own.

II. *The Canaanitish* epoch. This began at about 3000 B. C.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Shortly before the "kings of Ur and of the four quarters of the world." The inscriptions of these kings distinguish very often between the "*Nippurian* Enlil or Bel" and another, i. e., probably Marduk or possibly Dagan.

when the Canaanites invaded Babylonia. At the time of Hammurabi, at about 2200 B. C., they are masters of the whole of Babylonia. Their own specific god has become the god *κατ' ἐξοχήν*. These Canaanites made Babylon their capital. Their god became thus the city-god of Babylon, and when, in course of time the whole of Babylonia had been subjugated, the city-god of Babylon became the "god of Babylonia." We may call, therefore, this epoch, also the *Babylonian* epoch.

III. The *Assyrian*. During this time we find nearly all the characteristics, not only of the Sumerian but also of the Babylonian period, with this exception, however, that the specific god of the Assyrians is put at the head of the pantheon and worshipped in the royal capital of the Assyrian kings.

The god of the first epoch was *Enlil*, that of the second *Amar-ud* or *Marduk*, that of the third *An-shar*, which name was read at this time *Ashshur*. As Marduk displaced Enlil, so did Anshar displace Marduk. Such a "*displacing*," however, was only one in "*name*,"<sup>1</sup> not in essence, i. e., simply the name of the new victorious god was substituted for that of the old conquered god. Thus it happened that the attributes, genealogy, court, servants, etc., etc., of the conquered god were added to those of the victorious god, to whose glory, power, and honor they were thought to contribute greatly. Thus we get the strange phenomenon, that one and the same god may have *two* genealogies, two different kinds of servants, etc. In a historic investigation, such a phenomenon will always have to be kept in mind, and the question will have to be asked and answered: What genealogy belongs to the god *originally*, and what was *transferred* to him? That such questions can be answered only by taking into consideration the *historic development* of the Babylonian religion, is, of course, self-evident. As times went on, the attempt was made to harmonise or better identify such two originally very different genealogies. The result of such harmonising or identification was that, e. g., the father of the conquered god was made to be the same as the father of the victorious, at that

---

<sup>1</sup> See also my remarks with regard to the change of the name of El-shaddai into that of Jahveh, *Creation-Story*, p. 58.

time reigning, god, and so on. The outcome of such an attempt was finally not merely henotheism but an almost pure monotheism.

Not only, however, were the attributes of the Sumerian Enlil transferred to Marduk resp. Anshar or Ashshur, but even the very name "Enlil" became a title of these latter gods—a title, which, is generally transcribed and read *bêl*, i. e., "lord," but which still betrays to us the fact that Marduk<sup>1</sup> as well as Anshar played the rôle of Enlil, nay, were in all particulars—even with regard to their respective genealogies—identified with him. In a hymn, written at the time of Ashshur-bân-apal, King of Assyria, Ashshur is addressed as follows:<sup>2</sup>

1. "The great one, the hero of the gods, the omniscient,
2. "The esteemed one, the glorious one, the *En-lil-lal* of the gods, he  
who determines the fates,
3. "An-shar (=Ashshur), the great lord, the omniscient,
4. "The esteemed one, the glorious one, the *En-lil-lal* of the gods, he  
who determines the fates
5. "[ ] An-shar, the powerful one, the hero of the gods,  
the *lord of the lands*."

In the very same hymn we further learn, that Ashshur has his abode in *É-char-sag-gal-kur-kur-ra*,<sup>3</sup> i. e., in the "house of the great mounain of the lands, or in the *É-shar-ra*, i. e., "the house of the totality."<sup>4</sup> He is "the creator of AN-NA, the builder of the forests,"<sup>5</sup> "the creator of the gods, the one who begot Ishtar."<sup>6</sup> His lordship is glorified by Anu, Enlil, Ea, Bêlit-ilî, the Igigi, and the Anunnaki in the Ubshugina, i. e., the place or room of the assem-

<sup>1</sup> C. S. p. 69.

<sup>2</sup> 1. *shur-bu-ù e-til ilâni<sup>mesh</sup> mu-du-ù ka-la-ma*

2. *kab-tu shù-tu-qu ilu EN-LIL-LAL ilâni<sup>mesh</sup> mu-shim shi-ma-a-ti*

3. *An-shar bêlu shur-bu-ù mu-du-ù ka-la-ma*

4. *kab-tu shù-tu-qu ilu EN-LIL-LAL ilâni<sup>mesh</sup> mu-shim shi-ma-a-ti*

5. [ ]-bi An-shar dan-dan-nu e-til ilâni<sup>mesh</sup> be-el ma-ta-a-ti.

Craig, *Rel. Texts.*, I. p. 32, 1-5.

<sup>3</sup> [*ilu a*]-shib *É-char-sag-gal-kur-kur-ra*, Craig, *loc. cit.*, I. 8.

<sup>4</sup> [*ilu a*]-shib *É-shar-ra An-shar mu-shim shimât<sup>mesh</sup>*. Craig, *loc. cit.*, I. 10.

<sup>5</sup> [*ilu*] *ba-nu-ù shu-ut AN-[N]A (!) pa-ti-qu chur-sha-a-ni*. Craig, *loc. cit.*, I. 15. For AN-NA see below!

<sup>6</sup> [*ilu*] *ba-nu-ù ilâni [me]<sup>sh</sup> mu-al-lid ilu Ish-tar*. Craig, *loc. cit.*, I. 16.

bling hand."<sup>1</sup> Similar are Anshar's titles in a prayer of Sinacherib (?), where we read:<sup>2</sup>

1. "To Ashshur, the king of the totality of the gods, to him who begot himself,<sup>3</sup>  
the father of the gods.
2. Who prosper by his hand in the abyss,<sup>4</sup> the *king of heaven and earth*,
3. The lord of all the gods, to him who begot<sup>5</sup> the Igigi and the Anunnaki,
4. Who built the heaven of Anu and the "great place," who made all men,<sup>6</sup>
5. Who inhabiteth the bright heavens, the *Enlil of the gods*, who determines the  
fates,
6. Who dwelleth in É-shar-ra, which is in Ashshur, the great lord, his lord."

Not satisfied with this, the Assyrians went still a step farther. If Anshar be equal to Enlil, be indeed identical with him, then, it was quite natural for them that they should consider Ninlil, the wife of Enlil, to be also Anshar's wife. Sinacherib, when praying to Anshar, includes in his supplication also an address to the wife of Anshar, whom he calls:

"Nin-lil, queen of É-shar-ra, wife of Anshar, who created the great gods."<sup>7</sup>

These passages will suffice to prove that Anshar or Ashshur is in all respects the same as Enlil, whose name he even received.

<sup>1</sup> [*iu*A]-nu *iu*EN-LIL *iu*É-a *iu*Be-lit-il<sup>l</sup> *mesh* u *iu*[Igigi u *iu*Anunnaki] *shá* An-shar ina Ub-shú-ka(!)-na-ki it-ta-a'-i-du bélu (=en)-us-su. Craig, *loc. cit.*, p. 34, 6, 7.

<sup>2</sup> 1. a-na An-shar shar kish-shat ilâni<sup>mesh</sup> ba-nu-u ram-ni-shu ab(=ad) ilâni<sup>mesh</sup>.

2. *shá ina apst ish-mu-chu qat-tu-ush shar shamê<sup>e</sup> u irtsitim<sup>ti</sup>[m]*

3. *bél ilâni<sup>mesh</sup> ka-la-ma sha-pi-ik<sup>iu</sup> Igigi (=V+II.) u<sup>iu</sup> A-nun-na-[ki].*

4. *pa-ti-iq sa-mi<sup>iu</sup> A-nim u ki-gal-li e-pish kul-lat da-ad-me*

5. *a-shib bu-ru-mu ellâti<sup>mesh</sup> u<sup>iu</sup> EN-LIL ilâni<sup>mesh</sup> mu-shim shîmâti<sup>mesh</sup>.*

6. *a-shib É-shar-ra sha ki-rib Ashshur (=BAL-BAT)<sup>ki</sup> béli rabt<sup>i</sup> béli-shu.*

—Craig, *loc. cit.*, I., p. 83, 1-6.

<sup>3</sup> Ashur is here without father and mother, the self-existing god.

<sup>4</sup> I. e., the Anunnaki.

<sup>5</sup> Lit. = "poured out" = *râchû*. The Igigi and the Anunnaki are repeatedly called the *richât<sup>iu</sup> Anim*, i. e., "the outpouring" = seed of Anu. For this signification of *rachû* see Jensen, K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. pp. 365 ff. 513.

<sup>6</sup> Or human habitations.

<sup>7</sup> *iu*NIN-LIL shar-rat É-shar-ra chi-rat An-shar ba-nit ilâni<sup>mesh</sup> rabûti<sup>mesh</sup>, Craig, *Rel. Texts*, I., p. 77, 10.



Both are "the father and god of the gods,"<sup>1</sup> the "king of the gods," "the king of heaven and earth," the "creator of all mankind";<sup>2</sup> both have the same wife: Nin-lil.<sup>3</sup> We may make therefore the equation:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Anshar} &= \text{Enlil} = \text{Ashshur} \\ \text{Ninlil} &= \text{Bêlit} = \text{Ishtar}.\end{aligned}$$

Anshar has his abode in É-char-sag-gal-kur-kur-ra or in É-shar-ra; Ninlil, his wife, dwells in É-shar-ra; Enlil of the Sumerians dwells in É-kur. If Anshar and his wife be the same as Enlil and his wife, it would follow that their respective habitations—their temples, which here, as in all other cases, stand for a certain definite cosmic quantity—are also the same, i. e., that the cosmic É-char-sag-gal-kur-kur-ra or É-shar-ra be = the cosmic É-kur. If É-kur, "the mountain-house," be the realm of Enlil, and if Enlil be the king of "heaven and earth," then É-kur = É-shar-ra = É-char-sag-gal-kur-kur-ra must be = "heaven and earth" too!<sup>4</sup>

When making the equation Anshar (Ashshur) = Enlil, we would seem to be in straight contradiction not only to Damascius, but also to the Babylonian Creation Epic.

Damascius<sup>5</sup> informs us that Tauthe (= Tiâmat), the mother of the gods, and Apason (= Apsû) begot 1. Moûmis (= Mummu); 2. Lache (= Lachamu) and Lachos (= Lachmu); and 3. Kissare (= Kishar) and Assoros (= *Anshar*). By the latter two were born Anos (= Anu), Illinos (= Enlil), and Aos (= Ea). Damascius's authority for this statement is generally supposed to be the first tablet of the Babylonian Creation Epic, from which we learn, that Tiâmat and Apsû, "when their waters in one joined themselves together," brought forth Lach-mu and La-cha-mu, and later on

<sup>1</sup> Thus the *ab-ba dingir dingir-ru-ne* in E. B. H. p. 97, and C. S. p. 19, 9, ought to be translated.

<sup>2</sup> For these attributes in connection with Enlil see my *Creation Story*, p. 19 f.

<sup>3</sup> Just as Enlil became a title, viz., *bêl* = lord, so Ninlil became at this time = *bêlît* = mistress—an attribute borne chiefly by Ishtar, who therefore appears in most cases as the wife of Ashshur.

<sup>4</sup> This against Jensen, *Kosm.*, p. 194; K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. pp. 50, 41; 369, who thinks that É-kur, etc., be = earth!

<sup>5</sup> Zimmern, K. A. T.<sup>3</sup> p. 490; Carus, *Monist*, XI., p. 405.

also (?) An-shar and Ki-shar. A long time after these latter two there were born also Anu, Enlil, and Nugimmut (= Ea). If we compare these two accounts we find, that Moūmis (= Mummu<sup>1</sup>) is not mentioned at all in the beginning of the Babylonian Creation Epic. Later on he is introduced quite abruptly and seems to have been a "son of Apsū."<sup>2</sup> In the newly-discovered fragments of this very same Epic<sup>3</sup> Mummu appears as a messenger (!)<sup>4</sup> of Apsū, which latter, together with his wife, Tiāmat, and Mummu enters into a conspiracy against the newly-created gods, who had by their "action" disturbed him. Ea hears of this conspiracy and puts—it would seem—an end to Apsū and Mummu.<sup>5</sup>

But how could Damascius possibly put Mummu before Lachmu and Lachamu, seeing that the first tablet of the Creation Epic cannot have been in this respect his authority?

In order to explain this we shall have to consider somewhat more fully Damascius's statement as well as that of the first tablet of the Babylonian Creation Epic.

We begin with:

#### A. MUMMU.

The Babylonian Mummu was correctly recognised to be the prototype of the Greek Μωμμος (Moūmis)—an attribute not only of Tiāmat,<sup>6</sup> but also of god Ea.<sup>7</sup> The god Ea is the Sumerian En-KI,

<sup>1</sup> Mummu appears there only as an attribute of Tiāmat, K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. p. 2, 4.

<sup>2</sup> K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. p. 4, 17. According to Damascius, however, he is undoubtedly a son of Apsū and Tiāmat: ἐξ ὧν μονογενῆ (!) παῖδα γεννηθῆναι τὸν Μωῦμιν. K. A. T.<sup>3</sup> p. 490. Notice the μονογενῆ (!) = only begotten!

<sup>3</sup> King, *The Seven Tablets of Creation*, Vols. I. and II.

<sup>4</sup> I. e., the son! Cf. Nin-Girsu and Enlil, Nusku or Nergal and Sin, etc.

<sup>5</sup> According to these new facts, brought out by Mr. King's book, we would have to distinguish two "fights" in the Creation Epic: (1) That of Ea against Apsū and Mummu. (2) That of Marduk against Tiāmat. The result of both these "fights" is the same: Apsū and Mummu as well as Tiāmat are done away with, are conquered and killed. And because Apsū and Mummu were killed by Ea before Marduk entered the field of battle, we may see in this the reason why Qingu, who takes the place of Apsū, plays such a significant rôle in the Epic, and why Mummu is not mentioned at all in the first tablet.

<sup>6</sup> K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. p. 2, 4; Carus, *loc. cit.*, p. 409: *mu-um-mu ti-amat mu-al-li-da-at gi-im-ri-shu-un*.

<sup>7</sup> Merodach-Baladan-stone (*Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, II. p. 261), col. III. 5:

i. e., "Mr."<sup>1</sup> KI, and as such the "god of the terrestrial ocean." On another place<sup>2</sup> I have shown that "Mr." KI was a brother of AN, "the heavenly ocean." Mr. KI's mother is said to have been *dingir GUR* = the primeval ocean or Tiâmat; hence, if *dingir GUR* be the mother of Mr. KI, she also must have been the mother of Mr. AN. At the time when I wrote my *Creation-Story*, I was not aware of the fact that there was to be found in the cuneiform literature an excellent corroboration of this statement. While studying Jensen's *Kosmologie* I found that he already had mentioned two passages<sup>3</sup> in which *dingir Gur* is called the *dingirâm-ù-tu-AN-KI*, which name can be translated, however, only by "the mother that brings forth AN and KI," and not, as Jensen does, "the mother that brings forth heaven and earth," for if *dingir GUR* be the mother of Mr. KI, and if Mr. KI be "the terrestrial ocean," it follows, that KI in the name *dingirâm-ù-tu-AN-KI* cannot mean "earth." And if KI means "the terrestrial ocean," then AN must mean "the heavenly ocean," who is a brother (achu) and as such opposed to (an achû) the terrestrial one. This name also proves that according to the Sumerian conception, upon which Genesis i. is based, the world was not *created* but *generated*, that we have to see indeed in Genesis i. a תולדות (Toledoth), a "generation" of heaven and earth, a *cosmogony*, which *cosmogony* in Sumerian is at the same time a *theogony*!

Mr. KI or Ea, the god of the terrestrial ocean, was considered to be the father not only of the "produce of the sea," but also of the "produce of the earth,"<sup>4</sup>—he, therefore, is called the *mummu* or *ocean*,<sup>5</sup> that builds, creates, produces (*ba-an*) everything (*ka-la*).<sup>6</sup>

---

(*iu E-a . . .*) *mu-um-mu ba-an ka-la*. Marduk, the son of Ea, is called (Craig, *Rel. Texts*, I. p. 31, 23) = *mâr mu-um-me*, i. e., the son of *mumme*.

<sup>1</sup> "Mr." = *en* is used here in opposition to "Mrs." = *nin*, i. e., *en* is the husband and *nin* is the wife. The translation "lord" for *en* and "mistress" for *nin* does not give in this particular case the correct and intended meaning. In other words: *en* = lord is the *sensus litteræ*, while *en* = Mr. is the *sensus literalis*.

<sup>2</sup> *Creation-Story*, p. 33 ff.; *Monist*, XII. p. 600.

<sup>3</sup> II. R. 54, No. 3, 18; III. R. No. 1, 25-26.

<sup>4</sup> *Creation-Story*, p. 37; *Monist*, XII. p. 604.

<sup>5</sup> Sic! Against, Jensen, K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. p. 303: "Form." See also Delitzsch, *Handwörterbuch*, p. 415b. Marduk, the *mâr mu-um-me* is therefore the same as Marduk *mâr apsi*.

<sup>6</sup> See above, p. 75, note 7.

Damascius, when explaining the name Moūmis, calls him a *νοητὸς κόσμος*, which is generally translated by “intelligible world.”<sup>1</sup> The word for “cosmos” in Sumerian is AN-KI. Hence Moūmis = Mummu = ocean must have consisted of an AN and a KI., i. e., of something that is “above” and “below.” Moūmis, then, was the ocean that was “above and below”—but this he was not as yet in *fact*, in *reality*, but only in *mind* (*νοητὸς*!). Hence Mummu = Moūmis must have been the “heavenly and the terrestrial ocean” before the *actual* separation or better *differentiation* took place, i. e., before he was considered by the Babylonians as consisting of two brothers (*achu*), who at the same time were opposed to each other (*achū*).<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, Damascius calls Moūmis the “*μονογεμῆ* (!) *παῖδα*,” the *only begotten* son of Apason and Tauthe! If, therefore, Moūmis be a *νοητὸς κόσμος*, an ocean consisting “in mind” of an AN and a KI, of an “upper and lower” part, and if *dingir* GUR be “the mother that brought forth the upper (*an*) and the lower (*ki*) ocean,” and if the upper part became god AN and the lower part god KI, then Moūmis must be the common name for god AN and god KI before they had been differentiated. This god AN and this god KI were—before their differentiation—“the *only begotten*” of Apsū and Tiāmat, hence if Damascius says,<sup>3</sup> that out of Tauthe and Apason be born also “another” generation, viz., Lache and Lachos, he *contradicts himself*! This contradictory statement of Damascius, has led, it is strange to notice, nearly all translators, even Professor Jensen, to translate lines 9–10 of the first tablet of the Epic as follows: (When Apsū and Tiāmat their waters in one had joined together) 9 “da wurden die Götter gebildet [— — —], 10, da entstanden [*zuerst*] Lachmu und Lachamu.”<sup>4</sup> Having recognised the contradiction in Damascius’s statement, we have to separate line 10 from line 9 by a “period” and begin a new sentence! Translate: “When . . . then the gods were created. Lachmu and Lach-

<sup>1</sup> Zimmern, K. A. T<sup>3</sup>. p. 490; Carus, *Monist*, XI. p. 406 f.

<sup>2</sup> See *Creation-Story*, pp. 34, 64; *Monist*, XII. p. 601.

<sup>3</sup> K. A. T<sup>3</sup>. p. 490: ἐκ δὲ τῶν αὐτῶν (i. e., Tauthe and Apason) ἄλλην γενεὰν προελθεῖν, Λαχμὴν καὶ Λαχον.

<sup>4</sup> Jensen, K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. pp. 2, 9, 10.

amu came into existence, etc." By this translation we are left in doubt with regard to the parents of Lachmu and Lachamu, who otherwise are mentioned quite frequently in the Babylonian Creation Epic. What else we learn about Lachmu and Lachamu may be classified under the following heads:

#### B. LACHMU AND LACHAMU.

1. They are the *parents of An-shar*, who therefore is the son of Lachmu and Lachamu.<sup>1</sup>

2. They are the *parents of Marduk*. Marduk becomes thus; together with Anshar, a son of Lachmu and Lachamu.<sup>2</sup>

3. *Tiâmat* appears as the *enemy* of Lachmu and Lachamu.<sup>3</sup>

4. Lachmu and Lachamu are *creators*, and those whom they had created are to be found at the side of *Tiâmat*.<sup>4</sup>

5. *ilu*La-cha-mi is one of the eleven helpers of and created by *Tiâmat*.<sup>5</sup>

Summing up these facts we would have to distinguish—it seems—between at least the following Lachmus and Lachamus:

a. the parents of Anshar and Marduk, Nos. 1, 2.

b. the enemies of *Tiâmat* and creators, Nos. 3, 4.

c. and Lachami as one of the eleven helpers of *Tiâmat*.

This confusion is increased, if we take into consideration two lists of gods,<sup>6</sup> where *ilu*Lach-ma and *ilu*La-cha-ma form one pair

<sup>1</sup> K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. p. 12, l. 11 ff.: 11. "Go, Gaga, present thyself to them," 12. "The command which I gave thee, make known unto them": 13. "An-shar, your (i. e., L. and L.'s) son hath sent me." Conf. *loc. cit.*, p. 16, 67; Carus, *Monist*, *loc. cit.*, p. 414, where it is recorded that Gaga did go to L. and L., and, when he appeared before them, said unto them: "An-shar *ma-ru-ku-nu u-ma-'i-ir-an-ni*," i. e., "Anshar, your son hath sent me." See, however, below sub C. 1.

<sup>2</sup> K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. p. 14, 55; Carus, *loc. cit.*, p. 414. Anshar dispatches his messenger Gaga to inform L. and L. that Anu and Nugimmut had been sent out already by him (i. e., Anshar) against *Tiâmat*—but with no result. "Whereupon I (i. e., Anshar) commanded Marduk, the wise one among the gods, *your son* (to go against *Tiâmat*)."

<sup>3</sup> K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. pp. 16, 65; 20, 124, 125; cf. p. 12, 4, and see below, C. 3.

<sup>4</sup> K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. p. 4, 4 below; cf. pp. 12, 17-18; 17, 76.

<sup>5</sup> K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. pp. 6, 17 (= Carus, *loc. cit.*, p. 411); 18, 89.

<sup>6</sup> II. R. 54, No. 3, 9, and III. R. 69, No. 1, obv. l. l. 14, 15.

among the "twenty-one who have An-na for their parent"<sup>1</sup> and where they are identified with *iluA-nu-um* and *An-tum*. In a third list<sup>2</sup> appears *iluLach-ma* even as the "*iluA-nu* of the totality of heaven and earth."<sup>3</sup>

The same confusion is met with

#### C. ANSHAR AND KISHAR.

1. The first tablet of the Babylonian Creation Epic mentions Anshar and Kishar after Lachmu and Lachamu, as children of whom? of Tiâmat and Apsû? or of Lachmu and Lachamu?<sup>4</sup> Later on, however, appears Anshar as the *son of Lachmu and Lachamu*.<sup>5</sup>

2. Anshar is the *father of iluA-ni(u)m*.<sup>6</sup>

3. Anshar<sup>7</sup> sends out Anu and Nugimmut against Tiâmat after he had been informed of her rebellion by Ea.<sup>8</sup> Anshar appears here evidently as the *chief opponent, chief enemy of Tiâmat*.<sup>9</sup>

4. Marduk, after having overcome Tiâmat, put into prison her helpers, taken the tablets of fate from Qingu, had, by doing all this, "completely established Anshar's supremacy over the enemy."<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See below.

<sup>2</sup> II. R. 54, No. 4, 7.

<sup>3</sup> *sha kish-shat AN-KI*, see below! For still other occurrences of *iluLachmu* see, besides the places quoted by Jensen, *Kosm.*, p. 275, also Craig, R. T. I. p. 8, Rev. 1: *iluLach*(=Tsab!)-*mu*, Craig, *loc. cit.*, p. 30, 37: *iluLach-me*; Zimmern, Shurpu, VIII. 19: *iluLa-ach-mu*.

<sup>4</sup> See K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. p. 2, 12; Carus, *loc. cit.*, p. 410. According to this passage, then, we are left in doubt as to the parents of Anshar and Kishar! According to Damascius, however, (see K. A. T<sup>3</sup>. p. 490: *εἶτα αὖ τρίτην ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν* i. e., Tauthe and Apason, *Κισσαρη καὶ Ἀσσωρον*), were Anshar and Kishar, the sons of Tiâmat and Apsû. If this be true, then Damascius would contradict himself here again, for he expressly told us that Mummu = Moûimis was the "only begotten" son of Tauthe and Apason!

<sup>5</sup> K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. pp. 12, 13; (=Carus, *loc. cit.*, p. 413); 16, 68 (=Carus, *loc. cit.*, p. 414). See already above, sub B. 1. Also these passages show quite clearly that Damascius's statement cannot be true.

<sup>6</sup> K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. p. 10, 1, 8, 10, 12.

<sup>7</sup> K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. p. 14, 53, 54.

<sup>8</sup> King, Tablet II.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. above, B. 3, where Lachmu and Lachamu are opposed to Tiâmat.

<sup>10</sup> K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. p. 28, 125; Carus, *loc. cit.*, 418.

*Marduk* apparently is here the *champion of Anshar*, the enemy of *Tiāmat*.<sup>1</sup>

5. Anshar and Kishar are likewise to be found among the "twenty-one who have An-na for their parent," and as such again either = *ilu A-nu-um* and *An-tum*, or = *ilu An-num* "of the totality of heaven and earth."<sup>2</sup>

6. An-shar is the builder of *É-shar-ra*;<sup>3</sup> according to the fourth tablet of the Babylonian Creation Epic it is Marduk who builds it.<sup>4</sup>

7. An-shar is, as we have seen above, the common ideographic writing of the chief-god of the Assyrians: Ashshur.

This confusion throws a striking light upon the literary character of the Babylonian Creation Epic. Taking the above-given peculiarities into account, we would have to distinguish at least the following different sources—each source being represented by its own specific god, who at one time or another was the opponent of *Tiāmat*:

1. Lachmu (and Lachamu): B. 3.
2. Anshar: C. 3, 4.
3. Marduk: the whole of the Creation Epic as we have it now.
4. Ashshur, whose name is only the Assyrian equivalent of the Sumerian Anshar.

From this it would also follow, that these four gods were the same—at least in "essence," if not in name:

I. Anshar is = Lachmu<sup>5</sup> (and Lachamu), because both appear

<sup>1</sup> See No. 3 and cf. B., No. 3.

<sup>2</sup> II. R. 54, No. 3, 6; III. R. 69, No. 1, obv. 8, 9; II. R. 54, No. 4, 4.

<sup>3</sup> K. 3445 + Rm. 396, published in *Cuneiform Texts*, XIII. 24 f. See also Delitzsch, *Weltschöpfungsepos*, No. 20, p. 51 ff.

<sup>4</sup> "After the lord (i. e., Marduk) had measured the form (?) of the ocean He erected "a great house" (*esh-gal-la*) like unto it; (i. e., like unto the ocean), viz., *É-shar-ra*, 'The great house,' viz., *É-shar-ra*, which he had built as a (or: to be a) *sha-ma-mu*

He caused *ilu A-num*, *ilu En-lil*, and *ilu Éa* to inhabit as their city."

K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. p. 30, 144-146 (Carus, *loc. cit.*, p. 419).

<sup>5</sup> Just as Nin-Girsu, the son of Enlil, was identified with his father, cf. among other arguments also the name: *É-ninnū-dingir* Im-gig-ghu-bar-bar (ninnu = Enlil), and as the "angel of the Lord" with the "Lord," so was Anshar, the son of L. and L. (B. i.), with Lachmu.

- a.* as the enemy of Tiâmat: C. 3, 4; B. 3;
- b.* among the "twenty-one who have Anna for their parent";
- c.* are identified ( $\alpha$ ) either with *iluA-nu-um* (and *An-tum*), ( $\beta$ ) or with *iluA-num* "of the totality of heaven and earth."

II. Anshar = Marduk:

- a.* both are the sons of Lachmu (and Lachamu): B. 1; B. 2.; C. 1.
- b.* both are the builders of *É-shar-ra*: C. 6.
- c.* both are the enemies of Tiâmat; Anshar: C. 3, 4; Marduk: the whole Creation Epic in its present literary form.

III. Anshar = Ashshur: C. 7.

The rôle of Ashshur as creator was derived from Anshar, or better: "Ashshur the creator" can also be read "Anshar the creator." Marduk the creator derived his power from Enlil, whom he displaced and whose name and attributes he received. Above we have seen, that even Anshar = Ashshur was completely identified with, and even called, Enlil. If therefore Anshar be = Enlil, and if Anshar be also = Lachmu, then Lachmu must be = Enlil too!

Enlil is the "king" of "heaven and earth," Anshar as well as Lachmu are = *iluA-num* "of (the totality of) heaven and earth"—hence if our identification, Enlil = Anshar = Lachmu, be correct, then Enlil the "king of heaven and earth" must be = *iluAnum* "of (the totality of) heaven and earth," i. e., Enlil = Anum!

This result sheds a new and unexpected light upon the hitherto completely misunderstood<sup>1</sup> three lists of gods, mentioned above.

For the sake of completeness and on account of their importance I may be permitted to give them here in transcription.

LIST I.: II. R. 54, No. 3.

This list arranges the "twenty-one who have Anna for their parent," in *pairs*. These pairs are husband and wife. The first three lines, which are separated from the rest, must contain only one out of the twenty-one names. This *one* name is explained according to its different meanings, which it may have when brought into relation to the following ten pairs. It reads:

---

<sup>1</sup> Jensen, *Kosm.*, pp. 192 f., 272 f.; Zimmern, K. A. T<sup>3</sup>, p. 506.



I. 1. <sup>1</sup>	AN	<i>iluA(!)<sup>2</sup>-nu(!)<sup>2</sup>-[um]</i>
2. AN, i. e., <sup>3</sup> <i>An-tum</i> <sup>4</sup> = <sup>5</sup>		<i>irtsitim</i> <sup>6</sup> [ <i>tim</i> ]
3. AN-KI <sup>7</sup>		<i>iluA-nu ù [An-tum]</i>
<hr/>		
II. 4. <i>dingir</i>	IB <sup>8</sup>	<i>dingirNin-[IB<sup>8</sup>]</i>
III. 5. <i>An-shar-gal</i> <sup>9</sup>		<i>dingirKi-shar-[gal]</i> <sup>10</sup>
IV. 6. <i>An-shar</i> <sup>11</sup>		<i>dingirKi-[shar]</i> <sup>12</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Roman numbers indicate the "pairs." The Arabic numbers give the lines of the inscription.

<sup>2</sup> Copy gives for A-nu = ZI, but wrongly.

<sup>3</sup> Sign GUR : S<sup>c</sup> 239 = Brünnow, *List*, No. 7315.

<sup>4</sup> The sign for god is wanting in order to avoid a possible misreading : *ilāni* (= gods of) *Tum*. See also note to Anshargal !

<sup>5</sup> The common "sign of separation," Brünnow, *List*, No. 7757.

<sup>6</sup> Written KI[ ]. Notice here that AN = KI !

<sup>7</sup> If KI = *irtsitu* = *Antum* = AN, and if *iluA-nu-um* be also = AN, then we have to see in this AN = the first pair !

<sup>8</sup> According to II. R. 54, No. 4 (see below!) IB has the gloss : *ú-ra-ash*, and according to II. R. 57, obv. C. l. 31, that of *ú-ra-ášh*, as such he is identical with *iluNIN-IB sha ud-da-zal-li*. This latter passage shows that we should read in each and every instance the god *dingirIB* resp. *dingirNIN-IB* = *dingirUrash* resp. *dingirNin-urash*. Zimmern, *Babylonische Busspsalmen*, p. 50, thinks that *urash* be a Semitism, it being derived from *erêshu* = "entscheiden." Not from *erêshu* = "entscheiden," however, but from *erêshu* = "to irrigate" (!), Delitzsch, H. W. B. p. 140b, has *urash* "to be derived." This holds true not only of the *iluIr-resh* = *êrish* in IV. R. 34, 51b, and the *iluIr-ri-esh* UR-SAG in Reisner, *Hymnen*, pp. 86, 8; 134, 25, 26, but also of the "Eresh" in the name of the goddess *Eresh-ki-gal*, against Jensen, K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. p. 388, who takes *eresh* here in the sense of "gewaltig." Hence *dingirNin-IB* (= *urash*) is also called *dingirEngar* (= *erêshu*) = "the irrigator," as such he is the god of the "farmers" = *ikkaru* = *engar*! Cf. also *Ur-dingirNin-Girsu* = *ikkaru* = farmer (C. S. p. 66, note). This also proves that *dingirNin-Girsu* is = *dingirEngar* = *dingirNin-IB* (= *urash*) which latter, originally masculine, was identified not only with *dingirIB* but even with *dingirNin-IB*, the wife of *dingirIB* !

<sup>9</sup> *Shar* = *CHI* = *kishshatu* = totality. The sign for "god" = *an* is wanting before this name, because, if it had been written, one might read "*dingir-dingirshar-gal*" and translate "the gods of the great totality." In order to avoid such a possible reading and translation, the sign for "god" was omitted. Cf. also *Antum* and *An-shar*. The name signifies : "the great upper totality."

<sup>10</sup> "The great lower totality"—as such opposed to the upper one !

<sup>11</sup> For this writing instead of *dingirAn-shar*, see sub *An-shar-gal*. The name means = "the upper totality."

<sup>12</sup> The lower totality."

V. 7. <i>dingir</i> En-shar <sup>1</sup>	<i>dingir</i> Nin-[ <i>shar</i> ]. <sup>2</sup>
VI. 8. <i>dingir</i> Du-uru	<i>dingir</i> Da-[ <i>uru</i> ] <sup>3</sup>
VII. 9. <i>dingir</i> Lach-ma <sup>4</sup>	<i>dingir</i> La-cha-m[ <i>a</i> ] <sup>5</sup>
VIII. 10. <i>dingir</i> É-kur <sup>6</sup>	<i>dingir</i> Gá-r[ <i>a</i> ] <sup>7</sup>
IX. 11. <i>dingir</i> A-la-la	<i>dingir</i> Be-li-l[ <i>i</i> ] <sup>8</sup>
X. 12. <i>dingir</i> ditto(=A-la-la)-alan	<i>dingir</i> ditto(=Be-li-li)-alan
XI. 13. <i>dingir</i> En-uru-ul-la	<i>dingir</i> Nin-uru-ul-la <sup>9</sup>
14. 21 en ám-	a-a An-na-ge(!) <sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Either Mr. Shar (=totality) or "lord of the totality."

<sup>2</sup> Mrs. Shar, or mistress of the totality. These two names as well as those in l. 13 show, that these *pairs* are husband and wife!

<sup>3</sup> Both these names have to be translated by "Eternal (one)" = Hebr. עוֹלָם, and are as such Semitic names. Cf. also l. 13.

<sup>4</sup> Sign *lach* = *LUCH*, so generally. For other writings, see besides note 3 above p. 79, also *dingir*Lach-mu, K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. pp. 2, 10 [12, 4]; 16, 68; *dingir*Lach-cha, K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. p. 20, 125, and Λαχος.

<sup>5</sup> Also written *dingir*La-cha-mu, K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. pp. 2, 10; [12, 4]; 20, 125. *dingir*La-cha-me, *loc. cit.*, p. 16, 68, (In *loc. cit.*, p. 18, 89 appears this name among the eleven helpers of Tiāmat); Λαχη. What these names mean, is not yet apparent, but cf. at the present the note of Houtsma, *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1902, p. 329 ff., on עֶלְיָן, עֶלְיָהוּ, and עֶלְיָהוּ.

<sup>6</sup> "The god of E-kur." É-kur is the temple of *dingir*En-lil in Nippur. Hence *dingir*É-kur = *dingir*En-lil!

<sup>7</sup> *dingir*Gá-ra for *Gar-ra* = *Gál-la* = Assyrian *Muallidtu* = "the one who brings forth." For *gá* = *gal* see Jensen, *Z. A. I.* 192; Strassmaier, *Syll.* 154. This pair is left out in the list III. R. 69, No. 1, obv., where instead of it the pair *AN* + *KI* is added.

<sup>8</sup> For this reading see Jensen, *Kosm.*, 272, 2. She appears as the sister of Tammuz, who is "her only brother" (*a-chi e-du*) as well as "the paramour (Buhle) of her youth" (*cha-mer tsi-ich-ru* [*ti-sha*]): K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. p. 90, 51, 55, 47. Jensen, *loc. cit.*, p. 404, thinks it not impossible that *Belili* be = *Bulala*, the queen of *PA-AN*, mentioned in II. R. 60, 27a and 26b. *PA-AN* he takes to be a name for "the nether world." An identification of *Belili* with the Elamitic divinity *Belala* or *Bilala* he does not venture to maintain.

<sup>9</sup> "Lord resp. Mistress of the eternal city." Cf. l. 8.

<sup>10</sup> III. R. 69, No. 1, obv. 22 has: 21 en ám-a-a An-na-ge-ne. *Am-a-a* is translated in IV. R. 25 f. by *a-bi um-mi*:

25. zi *dingir*En ám-a-a *dingir*En-lil-lal-ge ghe-pad

26. nish be-el a-bi um-mi sha <sup>11u</sup>EN-LIL lu-u ta-ma-a-ta.

27. zi *dingir*Nin ám-a-a *dingir*Nin-lil-lal-ge ghe-pad

28. nish be-el-ti a-bi um-mi sha <sup>11u</sup>ditto(=NIN-LIL) lu-u ta-ma-a-ta,

i. e., "by Bel resp. Belit the ám-a-a of Enlil resp. Ninlil mayest thou swear." This shows that *ám-a-a* may be applied to a male or a female god. *Am-a-a* lit. translated is = "mother-father," the Assyrian translates it by "father-mother"

Similar to the preceding is

LIST II.: III. R. 69, No. 1, OBV.,

where the names of the single pairs are arranged—with the exception of the second—not side by side, but one below the other. This list reads:

I. 1.	AN	<i>ilu A-nu-um</i>
2.	AN	<i>An-tum</i>
3. AN-KI <sup>1</sup>		<i>ilu A-nu-um u</i> (i. e., and) <i>An-tum</i>
III. 4. <i>dingir IB (=urash)</i>		ditto (i. e., <i>ilu A-nu-um u An-tum</i> ) <sup>2</sup>
5. <i>dingir Nin-IB (=urash)</i>		ditto
IV. 6. <i>An-shar-gal</i>		ditto
7. <i>dingir Ki-shar-gal</i>		ditto
V. 8. <i>An-shar</i>		ditto
9. <i>dingir Ki-shar</i>		ditto
IV. 10. <i>dingir En-shar</i>		ditto
11. <i>dingir Nin-shar</i>		ditto
VII. 12. <i>dingir Du-uru</i>		ditto
13. <i>dingir Da-uru</i>		ditto
VIII. 14. <i>dingir Lach-ma</i>		ditto
15. <i>dingir La-cha-ma</i>		ditto
IX. 16. <i>dingir A-la-la</i>		ditto
17. <i>dingir Be-li-li</i>		ditto

(conf. also II. R. 62, 21c: *AM-TU* [which has the gloss *a-ga-ri-in* in V. R. 29, 67g] = *a-bu um-mu*). It is a shorter form for *dm tu-ud-da* and *a-a tu-ud-da*: IV. R. 10, Rev. 51, and corresponds to our word "*parent*." The line in question may therefore be translated: "twenty-one of (*ge*) the lord (*en*), the parent (*dm-a-a*) *An-na* they are (*ne*)," i. e., twenty-one who are of the lord, the parent Anna or who have Anna for their parent. If this translation be accepted, then AN-NA-ge would be a genetivus *objectivus*. It may be, however, also a genetivus *subjectivus*. In this latter case the twenty-one would be = the "parent AN-NA"—thus leaving us in doubt with regard to the "parentship" of these twenty-one gods. If the AN-NA-ge be construed as a gent. subj., the translation would be: twenty-one (sc. names) of (=for) the lord, the parent AN-NA (they are). But whatever translation we accept—the result remains the same!

<sup>1</sup> This pair is not found in the above-given list, for there *an-ki* is used as a kind of introductory explanation not only to all the following pairs, but also to the pair AN! *An-ki* here takes the place of *dingir É-kur* and *dingir Gá-ra* of the preceding list.

<sup>2</sup> We would expect that *dingir IB* would be = *ilu An-nu-um* only, but not so here. Cf. for the present here *dingir En-lil* = king of heaven and earth, and *dingir Nin-lil* also = queen of heaven and earth, and see below!

X. 18. <i>dingir</i> ditto (= <i>A-la-la</i> ) <sup>1</sup> - <i>alan</i>	ditto
19. <i>dingir</i> ditto (= <i>Be-li-li</i> )- <i>alan</i>	ditto
XI. 20. <i>dingir</i> <i>En-uru-ul-la</i>	ditto
21. <i>dingir</i> <i>Nin-uru-ul-la</i>	ditto
22. 21 (!) <i>en am-a-a</i>	<i>An-na-ge-ne</i>

## LIST III.: II. R. 54, No. 4,

gives us the names of the "husbands" only. It reads:

1. [	] <i>AN</i>	<i>ilu</i> <i>A-nu-um</i>	
2. [	<i>dingir</i> ] ( <i>u-ra-ash</i> ) <sup>2</sup> <i>IB</i>	<i>ilu</i> ditto (= <i>A-nu-um</i> ) <i>sha ish-shim ik-ri-bi</i> <sup>3</sup>	
3. [	<i>A</i> ] <i>n-shar-gal</i>	<i>ilu</i> ditto (= <i>A-nu-um</i> ) <i>sha kish-shat</i> <i>AN-KI</i> <sup>4</sup>	
4. [	<i>A</i> ] <i>n-shar</i>	<i>ilu</i> <i>A-nu</i> ( <i>chi-bi</i> ) <sup>5</sup> ditto (= <i>sha kish-shat</i> <i>AN-KI</i> )	
5. [	<i>din</i> ] <sup><i>gir</i></sup> <i>En-shar</i>	<i>ilu</i>	ditto
6. <i>dingir</i>	<i>Du-uru</i>	<i>ilu</i>	ditto
7. <i>dingir</i>	<i>Lach-ma</i>	<i>ilu</i>	ditto
8. <i>dingir</i>	<i>É-kur</i>	<i>ilu</i>	ditto
9. <i>dingir</i>	<i>A-la-la</i>	<i>ilu</i>	[ditto
10. <i>dingir</i>	ditto (= <i>A-la-la</i> )- <i>alan</i>	<i>ilu</i>	[ ditto
11. <i>dingir</i>	<i>En-uru-ul-la</i>	<i>ilu</i>	[ ditto

Looking over these three lists we will have to admit that the "husbands" as well as the "wives" are the same "among themselves," for they are identified either with *Anum* resp. *Antum* or with *Anum* "of the totality of heaven and earth." If we succeed in identifying one husband resp. wife correctly—we *ipso facto* did it with all.

A good starting-point is, no doubt, *dingir* *É-kur*, i. e., "the god

<sup>1</sup> This writing shows that we have here also an arrangement according to *pairs*—or else the "ditto" in lines 18 and 19 would have to be referred to line 17—an hypothesis which is forbidden by the first list! Cf. List I., lines 11 and 12.

<sup>2</sup> *u-ra-ash* is the gloss to *IB*, giving its pronunciation. See above, note to *dingir* *IB*.

<sup>3</sup> I. e., "Anu who hears prayers." See also Jensen, *Kosm.*, p. 194 and note 1.

<sup>4</sup> I. e., Anu of the totality of heaven and earth.

<sup>5</sup> *chi-bi* = "is broken, damaged"—shows that the original from which this copy has been made, was unreadable here—the sign "*um*" probably having been broken away.

of É-kur." É-kur is the temple of Enlil—hence "the god of É-kur" can be only Enlil. And if *dingir* É-kur be = *dingir* Enlil, then his wife *dingir* Gá-ra must be *dingir* Ninlil. We are justified in saying:

The "twenty-one who have Anna for their parent" are nothing more nor less than *twenty-one different names (!) of god LIL* "the king of heaven and earth,"<sup>1</sup> the son of AN or "heavenly ocean"—of god LIL considered either

- a. as a whole =  $AN^2 = LIL = \text{רָקִיעַ}$  (firmament) = "heaven and earth" =  $an + an$  or  $an + ki = Anum + Antum$ .
- b. or as consisting of a male or female, i. e., of *husband* and *wife*:  $En-lil + Nin-lil = En-shar + Nin-shar = En-shar-gal + Nin-shar-gal = En-uru-ul-la + Nin-uru-ul-la = Anum + Antum$ .<sup>3</sup>
- c. or as "brother and sister" (i. e., *achu* + *achatu*):  $En-lil + Nin-lil = En-shar + Nin-shar = En-shar-gal + Nin-shar-gal = En-uru-ul-la + Nin-uru-ul-la$ .<sup>4</sup>
- d. or as "opposed to each other" (i. e., as *achû* and *achitu*):<sup>5</sup>  
 $AN + KI = An-shar + Ki-shar = An-shar-gal + Ki-shar-gal$ .

Although we have only *twenty-one* (!) names, yet we are supposed to have, according to the arrangement of the lists, eleven (!) pairs. This difficulty would require a few words of explanation.

*AN* is the first *name*, but also the first *pair*, for *AN* is not only explained by Anum and Antum,<sup>6</sup> but also by  $an = Anum$  and  $an = Antum = KI$ , i. e., = *irtsitim* or earth.<sup>7</sup> If *Antum*, the *wife*, be the "earth," then *Anum*, the *husband*, must be the *heaven*. Hence the

<sup>1</sup> C. S. p. 19, 4; *Monist*, XIII. p. 586.

<sup>2</sup> See below!

<sup>3</sup> From this it follows that  $lil = shar = shar-gal = uru-ul-la = (Anum + Antum \text{ sha kish-shat}) AN-KI$ , i. e., "the totality of heaven and earth." Hence the *shar* = *kishshatu* = totality in Enlil's and Anshar's temple É-shar is = the totality of heaven and earth—and the cosmic É-shar must be = *heaven and earth*!

<sup>4</sup> Does our modern custom of the wife's taking the "name" of her husband go back to this oldest of historic times, when the wife was the *sister*—thus also of *one flesh*—of her husband? Has anyone made this point the subject of a special investigation?

<sup>5</sup> C. S. p. 34 = *Monist*, XII. p. 601.

<sup>6</sup> See second list!

<sup>7</sup> See first list.

name AN reveals to us the remarkable fact that it is a *pair*, consisting out of *husband* and *wife*:

Anum + Antum, that the husband and wife are also brother and sister:

an + an,            and that the husband is opposed to the wife:  
an + ki            = heaven + earth—the husband being “above”  
                         and the wife being “below.”

Thus we find here a welcome corroboration of our statement<sup>1</sup> that “*heaven and earth*” were considered to be *one*. This one cosmic quantity was called not only LIL, but also AN. AN when translated into Semitic-Babylonian becomes = *shamê*. *Shamê*, therefore, *must* stand for “*heaven and earth*” too! “Heaven and earth” are the Sumerian as well as Semitic-Babylonian and Hebrew *terminus technicus* for “*cosmos*”—hence *shamê* must be = *cosmos*! Now we understand Hesychius’s remarkable statement quoted, but misunderstood, by Jensen in his *Kosm.*, p. 3: Σανη (read Σανη) ὁ κόσμος Βαβυλώνιος, i. e., “*shamê* is the Babylonian cosmos,” and Hesychius’s gloss to Βῆλος (= Marduk): οὐρανὸς καὶ Ζεὺς καὶ Ποσειδῶνος υἱός, i. e., Bel or Marduk (originally = Enlil!) is not only the οὐρανός (= *shamê* = AN = an + ki = heaven + earth), but also (our) Zeus, and a son of (our) Poseidon, the terrestrial ocean = EN-KI or Ea (originally AN, the heavenly ocean!).<sup>2</sup> The Sumerian AN, thus, is indeed a word for *cosmos* and stands as such for the first “pair,” i. e., either for an + an, or for an + ki = Anum + Antum, the personifications of “heaven and earth.”<sup>3</sup>

In Craig, *Religious Texts*,<sup>4</sup> we learn of “a house in Nippur” called *Dur-an-ki*<sup>5</sup>—a name which is translated by “band of heaven

<sup>1</sup> C. S. p. 52; *Monist*, XII. p. 619.

<sup>2</sup> All this against Jensen, *Kosm.*, p. 391.

<sup>3</sup> Against Jensen, *Kosm.*, p. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Vol. I. p. 19, l. 9: *esh En-lil-ki Dur-an-ki*.

<sup>5</sup> Hilprecht, *Excavations*, p. 462, mentions this *Dur-an-ki* in such a way, as if he only knew anything about the existence of this “house,” saying: “A fourth name (viz., of the zigurrat of Nippur), to state this distinctly here, occurs in another unpublished text... belonging to the results of our latest excavations at Nuffar.” The passage cited from Craig will show Hilprecht that the name *Dur-an-ki* of the zigurrat of Nippur was known *eight years* before he discovered (!) it!

and earth."<sup>1</sup> According to *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, Vol. X., p. 294, l. 1, it is the *É-char-sag-kur-kur-ra*, which is called "the band of heaven and earth"—hence *É-char-sag-kur-kur-ra* = *Dur-an-ki*. Above<sup>2</sup> we have seen that *É-char-sag(-gal)-kur-kur-ra* is not only = *É-shar-ra* but also = *É-kur* "the mountain house," hence also this latter must be = "band of heaven and earth." But the god of *É-kur*, the *dingir É-kur*, is one of the "twenty-one who have Anna for their parent," hence the "god of *É-kur*" must also be the "god of the band of heaven and earth." The god of *Ékur* being Enlil, Enlil becomes thus the "god of the band of heaven and earth."

Furthermore, just as the "band of the sill" is = sill,<sup>3</sup> and as the "firmament of heaven" is = heaven,<sup>4</sup> so is the "band of heaven and earth" = "heaven and earth"<sup>5</sup>—hence *DUR* = רִקִּיעַ, and *dur-an-ki* = firmament of heaven and earth = heaven and earth. The god of *Dur-an-ki*, Enlil, is therefore again the god of "heaven and earth" or of the "firmament of heaven and earth"!

Above we saw that *AN* is = heaven and earth = cosmos, hence the *dingir Dur-an*,<sup>6</sup> who is said to be = *ilu BE* (= *Bêl* = Enlil!), is not only a corroboration that our conclusions be correct, but this name also shows, that *dingir Dur-an* is not an abbreviation of *dingir Dur-an-ki*,<sup>7</sup> but a *correct* and *justified* writing. *dingir Dur-an* means the "god of the band of the *shamê*" = Σαῶν, which is the "*Babylonian cosmos*," i. e., heaven and earth = an + ki!

These considerations put us into a position to explain also the following peculiarities:

- a. The god *IM*, whom we identified with *Nin-Girsu* or *Im-gig-ghu bar-bar* is called "*the son of Anna*,"<sup>8</sup> instead of—as in case of *Nin-Girsu*—the son of Enlil. Anna being here only

<sup>1</sup> *Rikis shamê u itsirtim*, from *rakâsu* to bind.

<sup>2</sup> P. 74.

<sup>3</sup> K. 8665, Meissner, *Suppl.*, p. 14, hinten: *rikis sippi* = *sippi*.

<sup>4</sup> רִקִּיעַ הַשָּׁמַיִם = שָׁמַיִם, Gen. i. 8.

<sup>5</sup> *Dur-an-ki* = *an-ki*.

<sup>6</sup> II. R. 54, 4a.

<sup>7</sup> As Hilprecht, *Excavations*, p. 463, 2, thinks.

<sup>8</sup> Reisner, *Hymnen*, p. 120, 10, 15.

another name for Enlil, the "king of heaven and earth," must stand here likewise for "cosmos."<sup>1</sup>

- b. Very often we read of the "*hosts of A-nim*"<sup>2</sup> as well as of the "*warriors of A-num, i. e., (sic!) Da-gan.*"<sup>3</sup>

That Anum be here = Enlil is apparent from the following reasons:

- a. The *tsa-ab* resp. *qi-its-ri Anim* was rightly recognised<sup>4</sup> to correspond to the Hebrew יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת—hence Anim = Jahveh!
- β. According to Gen. ii. 1, the "hosts" belong to "the heaven and the earth"<sup>5</sup>—hence the "hosts of Jahveh" are those of "heaven and earth," i. e., Jahveh = cosmos.
- γ. "Heaven and earth" or the cosmos are in Hebrew as well as in Babylonian the respective domains of Enlil or Jahveh. The former has therefore the title "king of heaven and earth,"<sup>6</sup> and the latter "god of heaven and earth"<sup>7</sup>—hence Jahveh = cosmos = Enlil.
- δ. Anum is one of the "twenty-one who have Anna for their parent" and corresponds not only to the Sumerian *an + an* or *an + ki*, but also to *AN*, i. e., the Σαυη, and to the *AN* in *dingir Dur-AN*, i. e., he is the personified *cosmos*, as such also called *dingir É-kur* who is the *Enlil*. Hence *Anim* = *Enlil*. But if Anim be here = Enlil, then the *hosts* can be only the *children* resp. *grandchildren* of Enlil, i. e., *ZU* or the moon, *Nin-Girsu* or the thundering dark cloud, *UD* or the sun, *Innanna* or the morning-resp. evening-star, etc. These children are *gods* and *stars*

<sup>1</sup> See also the different genealogies of Ninib in my forthcoming article on Jahveh, and also the genealogies of Nusku, the son of Anu = Enlil = lord of heaven and earth = É-kur = Dur-an-ki, who again were identified with Ea = ocean and with Sin.

<sup>2</sup> See e. g. K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. pp. 122, 4; 134, 31 *et passim*: *qi-its-ri sha* <sup>iu</sup> *A-nim*.

<sup>3</sup> Sargon, *Bronce-Inscript.*, 14: *tsa-ab* <sup>iu</sup> *A-num* u (*Var. ù*) <sup>iu</sup> *Da-gan*.

<sup>4</sup> Jensen, K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. 431.

<sup>5</sup> לְיִכְלוֹ הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהָאָרֶץ וְכָכָא.

<sup>6</sup> lugal an-ki.

<sup>7</sup> יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהָאָרֶץ.



—even Nin-Girsu = Adad was considered to be a star: VR. 46, 44ab = *mul nu-mush-da* = *ilu Sha-gi-mu* and K. 263: [ ] *nu-mush-da* = *namashshû* = *ilu Adad*. *Shâgimu* is a name of Adad and signifies: “the one that roars or thunders.” See also Jensen, *Kosm.*, p. 140. Hence the בני אלהים mentioned together with Jahveh in Psalm xxix. 1 ff., can be only = the children of Enlil, as such also *gods* and *stars* and the *powers of nature*—for even according to Hebrew conception the stars belong to the רקיע (Gen. i. 14; C. S. p. 53), which רקיע again is = *Dur-an-ki*, the habitation of *dingir Dur-an* or Enlil! The יהוה צבאות corresponds, therefore, exactly to the title of Enlil “king of the gods” (*lugal dingir-ri-ne*) or to the *tša-ab* resp. *qi-its-ri Anim*.

- c. Above, p. 72, we heard that Anshar = Ashshur is said to have been the “creator of An-na”<sup>1</sup>—an expression which signifies the same as that on p. 73, above, where Anshar = Ashshur appears as the “builder of the heaven of Anim.”<sup>2</sup> Anu is in our three lists a name for “the god of É-kur,” i. e., for Enlil. AN or AN-NA, we saw, means = *Šavη* = Assyrian *shamê*—hence “the builder of AN-NA” can mean only the “builder or creator of the *cosmos*,” as such it is parallel to the “builder of the *sa-mi* (i. e., *Šavη* = *cosmos*) of *ilu A-nim* = Enlil. The “heaven(s) of Anu” therefore are not the abode of god AN, the heavenly ocean, but are in each and every case the *cosmos*, “heaven and earth” the abode of Enlil, or more especially, the “firmament of heaven” or “heaven” as opposed to the “firmament of the earth” or “earth,” the specific domain of Ninlil. “The great gods that inhabit the *shamê* of Anim” are therefore the moon, sun, the stars, and the powers of nature (= Adad), etc. Hence we cannot find in this phrase the idea—as Jeremias, *Vorstellungen vom Leben nach dem Tode*, p. 60, wants it—that the “Wohnsitz der Götter in verschiedene abgegrenzte Himmel geteilt ist.” See also Jensen, *Kosm.*, p. 11.

<sup>1</sup> *ba-nu-û shu-ut AN-[N]A*.

<sup>2</sup> *pa-ti-iq sa-mi ilu A-nim*.

- d. In the sentence "the daughter of Anu (= Ishtar) went to Bel her father," above p. 67, Anu and Bel signify the *same god*. Ishtar is the daughter of Bel because she is the *wife* (as such called *Bau*) of *Nin-Girsu*. But Nin-Girsu being the son of Enlil or Bel, his wife *had* to become *also* a daughter of Bel—because a wife is always the *sister* of her husband.
- e. As already said, the "heaven and earth," originally one, were later on differentiated and considered as husband and wife: Enlil + Ninlil = Enshar + Ninshar, etc.,—the wife being not only the sister but also "opposed" to her brother or husband. Thus it happened that there corresponds to the Enshar, the husband, an An-shar, and to the Ninshar, the wife, a *Ki-shar*, in other words: the husband was considered to be "above" = an, and the wife to be "below" = ki. The "heaven" becomes thus the husband of the "earth." This "heaven and earth" had two sons: the "moon (ZU) and the "thundering, lightning, dark cloud" (Nin-Girsu or Im-gig-ghu-bar-bar), who by means of his nature was the "mighty hero or prime minister" of his father. The "moon" had for his son the sun (UD). Exactly the same genealogy we find again in *Orac. Sib.*, III. 110 ff., where *Kronos*, *Titan*, and *Japetos* are called the sons of *Ouranos* (= heaven) and *Gaia* (the earth). Now, there cannot be any doubt that Kronos was *originally* the moon, who had become at the time when this genealogy was imported from the Babylonians, the "sun."<sup>1</sup> This change took place at a time when the people began to reckon according to "sun-years." We would like, therefore, to identify *Kronos* with UD the *sun* (originally the moon), *Titan* with *Nin-Girsu*, "the mighty hero," and *Japetos* with the *moon* (originally the sun).<sup>2</sup>

These identifications explain also correctly the hitherto mis-

---

<sup>1</sup>An analogy of this we find also in the Old Testament, Gen. i. 16, where the sun is likewise put before the moon and called "the greater light." See C. S., p. 65.

<sup>2</sup>This against Zimmern, K. A. T<sup>3</sup>. p. 351, who thinks that they are "genau entsprechend der babylonischen Trias Anu-Bel-Ea als Söhnen des Paares Anshar-Kishar.

understood statement of Berosus,<sup>1</sup> according to which *Kronos* warns Chisouthros (= *Ut-napishtim*), while according to the Babylonian flood-story it is Ea. On account of this peculiarity Jensen<sup>2</sup> identified *Kronos* with Ea; but wrongly! Ea is = Poseidon. Marduk is in the *theological* system the son of Ea or Poseidon. But Marduk is the AMAR-UD, i. e., the son of UD—according to his *name*—and UD is = *Kronos*, hence Marduk, the AMAR-UD, may quite correctly be called the “son of *Kronos*.” If *Kronos* was the father of Marduk, the chief-god of the Babylonians, then Ahuramazda *had to have* likewise *Kronos* for his father! Hence the gloss to Belos in the Arm. Vers. of Euseb. Chron., *loc. cit.*, p. 19: *κρόνον, quem patrem nuncupant Aramazdi*.<sup>3</sup>

Returning once more to our three lists we will have to distinguish between

- a. AN = “heavenly ocean,” who is called in two of our lists “the lord, the parent AN-NA,” and is as such the *father* of those twenty-one gods—or better of one god under twenty-one different names. In Assyrian this god is called Anum, and is a brother of Ea. Anu and Ea again are sons of the “mother that brought forth AN and KI = “heavenly and terrestrial ocean,” i. e., of *dingir GUR*.
- b. AN = cosmos. As such it stands either for an = Anum + an = Antum or for an = Anum + ki (i. e., earth) = Antum. *Anum*<sup>4</sup> *resp. Antum* is here only another name for Enlil *resp.*

<sup>1</sup> *Liber chron.*, edit. Schoene, p. 19–20.

<sup>2</sup> *Kosm.*, p. 391.

<sup>3</sup> This statement is very important. It shows that Ahuramazda was considered to be the same as Marduk—had therefore to have the same father. Ahriman and Ahuramazda is Marduk differentiated into the Marduk of the winter = darkness, and the Marduk of the summer = light. The Marduk of the winter is = Nebo, and the Marduk of the summer = AMAR-UD. Cf. the important passage Isaiah xlv. 7: “I am the lord . . . I form the light, and create darkness.” Here the prophet expressly denies that light and darkness have two different sources. Both have *one* god for their author,—a very correct Babylonian idea.

<sup>4</sup> This name Anum was even applied to the moon-god, Sin! See IV. R. 9, 6a, and K. 155, quoted by Jensen, *Kosm.*, p. 191, note 1. This is not strange. We know that in Ur as well as in Haran the god Sin was considered to be the highest god, hence—if he were—he *had* to receive all the attributes, names, etc., of Enlil. Yes, even Nin-Girsu the “mighty hero” of Enlil became Sin’s messenger and this under the name of Nusku *resp. Nergal*, see above, page 69, note 5.

*Ninlil*, the king resp. queen of "heaven and earth"! This AN is the Σαυη or κόσμος Βαβυλώνιος of Hesychius.<sup>1</sup>

- c. AN either = *shamû*, i. e., "heaven" or = KI., i. e., "earth." The former, when personified may also be called *Anum* or *Enlil*, and the latter *Antum* or *Ninlil*. That *KI* = *earth* was called *Antum* follows also from different other passages in the cuneiform literature, as, e. g., Reisner, *Hymnen*, p. 133,

<sup>1</sup> Here belongs beside the *dingir* *Dur-an*, and the expressions: "the creator of *AN-NA*," "the shamê of Anim," mentioned above, also

- a. *dingir* *Si* = *dingir* *En-lil*: V. R. 44, 35, because *Si* is = *shamû* = Σαυη! See II. R. 50, 25c, cf. II. R. 39, 47 f. (Against Jensen, *Kosm.*, p. 24.)
- b. *dingir* *BE* = *dingir* *En-lil*: I. R. 15, 51; V. R. 4, 111 etc., for *BE* is again = *shamû*: II. R. 7, 26a; V. R. 39, 45e.
- c. *dingir* *NAB*. The sign *NAB* is expressed by two *an*'s, one put above the other. *NAB* has according to Delitzsch, *Assyrische Lesestücke*, No. 90, the meaning *shamû*. This *NAB* is again (because = *an* + *an* = heaven + earth) = *Cosmos*. The *dingir* *NAB* is not only identified with *dingir* *En-lil* in V. R. 44, 46c., but he is called—like the "twenty-one who have *AN-NA* for their parent"—the *dumu sag AN-NA*, i. e., the first-born or principal son of *AN-NA* (= heavenly ocean): Reisner, *Hymnen*, pp. 140, 194; 135, col. IV. 1; 88, 7. And when this *dingir* *NAB* is called in II. R. 54, 10a, b, the "Bel of the *shamû*," he does not, as Jensen, *Kosmologie*, p. 25, cf. K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. p. 347 wants, stand for "den Punkt am Himmel, wo die verschiedenen Teilungslinien zusammenlaufen," but for the Bel of the Σαυη! [*NAB* is also = *Tiâmat*: 83-1-18, 1332 obv. II. 22, published in *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Arch.*, Dec., 1888, plate V. But *Tiâmat* is = *dingir* *GUR*, "the mother of *AN* and *KI*." *GUR* again is not only = *apsû*, "ocean," but also, if pronounced *zikum*, = *shamû*. Hence *NAB* signifies *Tiâmat* as the mother of the *apsû* or ocean considered as a cosmos or *shamû* or *AN* + *KI*, i. e., of the ocean as consisting of an upper and of a lower one!]
- d. Possibly even *AN-SHAR*, who might be read also *dingir* *SHAR*. *SHAR*, when pronounced "du," is also = *shamû*; hence *dingir* *SHAR* (= *du*) might be translated "the god of the Σαυη, i. e., cosmos! *É-shar* would accordingly become not so much "the house of the totality (= *kishshatu*)" as "the world-house. See also above, p. 80, where it is said of Marduk that he had build *É-shar-ra* as (or: to be) a *sha-ma-mu*, i. e., a Σαυη or cosmos! This *sha-ma-mu* here, because it is the habitation of *Anu*, *Bel* (= *Enlil*), and *Ea*, must include the two oceans—the heavenly and the terrestrial—also. This peculiarity is even adopted by the Priestcode. P.'s expression for "cosmos" is generally = "heaven and earth": Gen. i. 1, ii. 1, Ex. xxxi. 17; but also "heaven and earth and the □," i. e., ocean: Ex. xx. 2! The *É-shar-ra*, the world-house, is thus made = heaven and earth and ocean—a, no doubt, late conception, thus showing a tendency towards henotheism, resp. monotheism.

No. III. (sic!), ll. 10-13,<sup>1</sup> where Antum is expressed in the Sumerian line by KI, the ideograph for *irtsitu* = earth. Again on another place<sup>2</sup> this AN-NA is directly translated by *shamê* or "heaven," and the KI (or KI-a) directly by *irtsitim* or "earth"—thus proving beyond a shadow of doubt that *Anum* = *AN* is = heaven and *Antum* = *KI* is = earth. AN thus means indeed either *heaven* or (!) *earth*.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *dingir A-nun-na AN-NA a-ri-a-ne*

*u*ditto *sha ri-chu-ut u*A-nim *ri-chu-u*

*dingir A-nun-na KI (sic!) a-ri-a-ne*

*u*ditto *sha ri-chu-ut An-tum ri-chu-u*.

Instead of KI we have the correcter writing KI-a in Reisner, *loc. cit.*, pp. 132, 19, 20; 78, 12, 13. Cf. also IV. R. 21, No. 2, rev. 1. For *richûti* see Jensen, K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. p. 365, 6.

<sup>2</sup> *dingir A-nun-na AN-NA mu-ush V-bi*

*u*A-nun-na-ki *sha shamê V shu-shi*

*dingir A-nun-na KI-a mu-ush X-bi*

*u*A-nun-na-ki *sha irtsitim*<sup>um</sup> *ni-e-ir-shu*.

Reisner, *Hymnen*, p. 139, 155-158.

See also Reisner, *loc. cit.*, pp. 92, 24, 25; 135, col. III. 30. With regard to the 300 (=5 soss!) "Anunna of heaven," and with regard to the 600 (1 *nêr*) "Anunna of the earth," see Zimmern, K. A. T<sup>3</sup>. p. 453; Jensen, K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. p. 587. The passages cited in this and the preceding note are important. (1) We have here the Anunna of *heaven*, i. e., the Igigi and the Anunna of the *earth*, i. e., the Anunnaki, as they are generally called in the Assyrian inscriptions. Both classes are said to be the *richûti*, i. e., lit. "the pouring out" = *seed* or *sons* of Anu and Antum. (2) We have seen (C. S. p. 49) that the *king* of the storm-flood is Enlil, while the storm-flood itself is Nin-Girsu or Imgigghubarbar, the *son* of Enlil. Hence, when we read, that either Bêl, i. e., the old Enlil, be the "lord, the *king* of all Anunnaki" (Tiglat-Pileser I. = K. B. I. p. 14, col. I. 3), or that Anu be "the *king* of the Igigi and the Anunnaki" (Shalmanassar II., Obelisk = K. B<sup>1</sup>. p. 128, l. 2), or that Ashshur (= Anshar) be termed "the *king* of the Igigi" (Adad-nirâri III. = K. B<sup>1</sup>. p. 188, No. 2, ll. 2, 3), we must understand these statements as above, i. e., that these *kings* of the Igigi and the Anunnaki are at the same time their *fathers*, and if so, then Enlil is = Anu = Anshar. See here also above, p. 73, where it is expressly said that Anshar is he "who begot (*shâpik* = *râchû*!) the Igigi and the Anunnaki"! Where the moon-god Sin was considered to be the highest god, it is, of course, natural to find that these very same Igigi and Anunnaki should be assigned to his court, as is done in the celebrated hymn to Sin: IV. R. 9.

<sup>3</sup> That one and the same ideograph should have two diametrically opposed significations is not by any means uncommon—it is simply a corroboration of Winckler's maxim: "Jedes Ding schlägt schliesslich in sein Gegenteil um, wie es der Kreislauf der Natur vorschreibt und bedingt: Wir haben die unzertrennlichen und doch getrennten Dioskuren, Mond und Sonne = Tag und Nacht = Licht und Finsterniss = Winter und Sommer, die beiden Sonnen- und Naturhälften" (M. V. A. G., 1901, IV., Part I., p. 15, note 1), and I may add the "two halves of the world":

If we would sum up our results so far obtained they would be the following :

Out of the primeval ocean, Apsû and Tiâmat, the Sumerian GUR, is born mummu or Moûmis, *νοητὸς κόσμος*—which was only a “world,” i. e., an AN and a KI in *mind*, but not in fact. It became a world in fact, when AN begot LIL, who took his place between AN and KI, thus not only separating the AN from the KI, but forming with them the first *triad*. This LIL, the son of AN, appears in the lists above mentioned under twenty-one different names among which are also to be found Anshar and Lachmu. These names are arranged in pairs of husband and wife—the husband being considered the *upper* and the wife the *lower* part. The upper part is the heaven and the lower part the earth. This gives us the most important fact of our whole investigation, which is : heaven and earth are husband and wife, as such called Anum and Antum who again are only two other names for Enlil and Ninlil—Enlil is the heaven and Ninlil is the earth when considered as husband and wife, but when considered as “one flesh” Enlil resp. Ninlil is the “heaven and earth” or “cosmos,” hence may be called “king resp. queen of heaven and earth.”<sup>1</sup>

---

heaven and earth. Among the different ideographs that may stand either for “heaven” or for “earth,” I mention besides AN only the two following :

- a. *IM*=heaven, Sc. 288 ;=earth, *ibidem*. A double *IM*, Brünnow, List, No. 12241, cf. No. 8502, is translated in II. R. 50, 28c ; II. R. 48, 26a-b, by *shamû*, which latter can mean here only=cosmos=heaven + earth. Hence the *dingirIM* + *IM* in III. R. 67, 45e ; III. R. 67, 42e, cannot signify originally the god Adad (or Rammân) but Enlil or Bêl, the god of “heaven and earth.” Cf. here also “the gods who are above (*eli*) the *IM* and below (*shapal*) the *IM*” (Pinches, P. S. B. A., 1882, p. 164, 10-11), i. e., beyond the firmament or “heaven and earth,” which in the passage cited, p. 163, l. 10, is called the *Char-sag-kalam-ma*=mountain of the world !
- b. *U*=*shamû* “heaven” : V. R. 36, 45b ; *U*, also read *buru*, =*irtsitu* : V. R. 36, 46b and *U* is the ideograph for *dingirEn-lil* : V. R. 36, 5a. This ideograph therefore signifies Enlil as the god of “heaven and earth”—and just as in later times Enlil became an ideographic writing for *bêl* or lord, so *U* was used as an ideograph for *bêl*. Conf. here also V. R. 37, 4d. e, f : *buru* or A-buru=*shamû ruqtum* “the far away heaven,” and l. 5 : *buru*=*shamû shaplâtum* “the low(er) heaven,” which latter does not speak so much in favor of the “different” heavens, as it proves that the “lower heaven” be the *earth* !

<sup>1</sup> Therefore Anu is called also “(the one) of the totality of heaven and earth.”

It was not without some very definite reason that we had to linger so very long over this preliminary investigation, for here we are in direct opposition to all other Assyriologists, who either take Enlil to be the "god of the earth" or the "god of the air."

Our result is of the highest importance, not only for a right understanding of the Babylonian religion as such, but also for the religion both of the Old and the New Testament. In the latter it is especially the *doctrine of the Resurrection* which from our investigation receives a new and welcome light.

The doctrine of the Resurrection, because so closely connected with the personality of Christ, is the *central doctrine* of the Christian religion. It is the *pillar* upon which the Christian Church is built. With it Christianity stands and falls. Says St. Paul:

"If Christ be not raised, then is our preaching vain, our faith also is vain" (1 Cor. xv. 14.)

And again, v. 17:

"If Christ hath not been raised, your faith is vain."

It is, however, here of special interest to notice what *philosophic proofs* St. Paul is able to adduce for the resurrection of Christ. His proofs are:

"Now if Christ is preached that he hath been raised from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there is no resurrection of the dead, neither hath Christ been raised."<sup>1</sup>

The same argument is to be found also in verses 15, 16:

"We witnessed of God that he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead are not raised. For if the dead are not raised, neither hath Christ been raised."

Notice, St. Paul does not say: "because Christ rose, therefore the dead rise," but *vice versa*: "If there be no resurrection of the dead, then Christ did not rise;" he wants us, however, to draw the last conclusion: "there *is* a resurrection of the dead, and if there be, then did Christ rise!" Paul, then, takes it for an indisputable fact that the dead *can* and *do* rise, and because *they* can

---

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 12, 13.

and do rise therefore *Christ* also *could* and *did* rise. Hence with the resurrection of the dead, the resurrection of Christ is given. The fact of Christ's resurrection is thus based, according to St. Paul's argumentation, upon the fact of the resurrection of the dead as such. If you deny the latter, you *ipso facto* deny the former. Everything depends upon our belief in the resurrection of the dead. If we do not believe in this, we do not and cannot believe in Christ's resurrection! Hence, it is quite natural, that St. Paul, when adducing the arguments in favor of the resurrection of Christ, should bring in also those proofs which establish the truth of the resurrection of the dead! And what are these?

“But some one will say, how are the dead raised? and with what manner of body do they come? Thou foolish one, that which thou thyself sowest is not quickened, except it die: and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not the body that shall be, but a bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other kind.”<sup>1</sup>

The proof in favor of the resurrection of the dead is taken from *nature*! He compares the human bodies to “*grain*, it may chance of wheat, or of some other kind.” The grain is put into the earth not to die and remain there, but to die and be quickened again, and thus sprout anew, rise to new life, and bear fruit. But this the grain does only in the *spring*! St. Paul's argument then is this: As in the spring nature or mother earth brings forth new life, quickens the “*grain*,” makes it sprout again, so also the “*dead*” will be quickened, be raised to new life on that great morning when the eternal spring begins! *Nature* demonstrates the *fact* of the resurrection. This “*resurrection*,” because a fact in nature, was *transferred* to “*men*” also—because they too are a part of nature! Men, as a part of nature, could not make an exception, could not upset the laws of nature, hence had to rise. But if men, as a part of nature, do rise, then Christ also had to rise,—for he belongs to “*man*.” That is the argument of St. Paul.

Having made this clear, we may now pass to the details in

---

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 25.



connection with Christ's resurrection. These are probably enumerated best in the well-known, but most difficult, passage of 1 St. Peter iii. 18 ff., where we read :

“Christ also suffered for sins once . . . being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit, in which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which aforetime were disobedient . . . the resurrection of Jesus Christ, who is on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven ; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him.”<sup>1</sup>

According to this passage the specific historic facts connected with the resurrection of Christ occurred in the following sequence :

1. suffering, 2. death, 3. quickening, 4. (*a*) going and (*b*) preaching unto the spirits in prison, 5. resurrection.

As Christ's suffering has nothing to do with our investigation here, we confine ourselves to facts Nos. 2-5.

“Death” according to N. T. *usus loquendi* is the separation of the “life-principle” or “soul” from the “body.” The body is put into the grave while the soul continues to live as a “spirit.” To such spirits, i. e., souls separated from the body<sup>2</sup> Christ went and preached.

If “death” be a *separation* of the soul from the body, then the “quickenings” must be a *joining* together, a reuniting of the soul and body. Christ had to be dead, according to Scripture, for three days. During these three days, then, body and soul were separated. After these three days—or as the variant gives it: on the third day—he had to rise, hence his “being quickened” and his resurrection had to fall on the same day! Christ is said to have risen on early Easter-morning, hence his quickening or the re-

<sup>1</sup> ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἀπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἔπαθε . . . θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ, ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ τῷ πνεύματι ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν ἀπειθήσασί ποτε . . . δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὃς ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ, πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν, ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων.

<sup>2</sup> Also according to Babylonian conception the death consists in a separation of the *napishtu* or life-principle from the body. This *napishtu* continues to live after death as a so-called *ekimmu* or *utukku*, see also Jensen, K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. pp. 406, 453.

uniting of soul and body must have taken place on early Easter-morning too! As soon as this "quickening" had become a fact "he went and preached." If, therefore, the question be asked: "When did Christ go and preach?" the correct answer can be only this: "On early Easter-morning, immediately after his being 'quickened in spirit'!" In this (ἐν ψῆ) "being quickened in spirit" he went. Hence Christ's going and preaching did not take place during those three days, while his body was lying in the grave, nor did his *soul* only go down to the prison, but "his soul reunited to the body"—for he was *quickened*! Christ's journey to prison, then, falls between his being quickened and his resurrection, i. e., *like-wise* on early Easter-morning. As such a "quickened one in spirit," i. e., as one having acquired new life—a spiritual life<sup>1</sup>—he went and preached, or better: "he going preached" (πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν). And what did he preach? The "contents" of Christ's preaching is not given here. We are therefore obliged to determine the exact nature of this ἐκήρυξεν from the context. The word κηρύσσειν expresses simply the idea that Christ "was a herald," or "officiated as a herald," or "proclaimed something after the manner of a herald." A herald always acts in the name and upon the command of a *higher person*—hence whatever Christ proclaimed or heralded must have been something which he had received from someone else, something to which he was authorised. That this "something" cannot have been the "gospel" follows from the following consideration.

1. "To preach the gospel" is expressed in the New Testament *always* by εὐαγγελίζειν.

2. The verse in 1 Peter iv. 6: "*For unto this end was the gospel preached even unto the dead*" does not help us very much either, for "the dead" are those who were *alive* when the preaching took place, but who died in the meantime. Besides that, we have for the "dead" the word νεκροῖς,<sup>2</sup> and for to preach not κηρύσσειν but εὐαγγελίσθῃ.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the common explanation of the phrase, which, however, does *not* explain the difficulties involved, see my article on Jahveh!

<sup>2</sup> And not πνεύμασι or the "souls separated from the body"!

3. Whenever the contents of the proclaiming or heralding are given, this is expressed by an *object* which follows the verb *κηρύσσειν*. Thus we have to preach: "Moses," Acts xv. 21; "circumcision," Gal. v. 11; "the word," Mark i. 45; "the gospel (of the kingdom)," Matth. iv. 23; Mark xvi. 15; "baptism," Mark i. 4; "repentance and remission of sins," Luke xxiv. 47; "Christ," Acts viii. 5, and it is used of "*an angel* as God's herald" in Rev. v. 12.

4. Suppose, for the sake of argument, that Christ indeed *preached the gospel* unto the spirits in prison in order to give them a last chance to get out of it—but then we would be again in straight contradiction to the parable of the "rich man and poor Lazarus." What this parable wants to teach us is this: the "*time of salvation*" is *here upon earth*, not after death: "*They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them.*" If they hear them and do accordingly, they will be saved, if they do not listen to them they lose all chances of their salvation! Hence there was not and could not be offered to the "spirits that are in prison" a *last chance*!

This last consideration leads us over to the next point of our inquiry, viz., to the question with regard to the meaning of the "prison," *φυλακή*.

This prison appears here as a kind of "keeping-place," a place where the "spirits," the "souls separated from their bodies," the *ekimmu* or *utukku* are to be found. The *ekimmu* and *utukku* have, according to Babylonian ideas, their abode in the "nether world"—a place which was considered to be (within) the "*earth*." It would therefore be natural to suppose that this place, the nether world, Hades, place of departed spirits, be also meant here. If it be, then it has to be subdivided again—according to the parable of the "rich man and poor Lazarus"—into two subdivisions: (1) a seemingly *comfortable* place, which is called in that parable: Abraham's bosom (*κόλπος Ἀβρααμ*); (2) an *uncomfortable* one or Hades proper. In the former we find Lazarus, in the latter the rich man. Both of these men arrive in their respective abodes as soon as they die:

"And the beggar died, and . . . was carried away by the angels into Abraham's bosom, and the rich man also died, and was buried . . . and in Hades he lifted up his eyes, being

in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom !”

If the “prison” of St. Peter be the same as the Hades with its two subdivisions, the question may be asked : Did Christ go to the “uncomfortable” or the “comfortable” part of Hades in order to preach? According to St. Peter Christ preached “unto the spirits in prison, which aforetime were *disobedient*.” The assumption, therefore, might seem to favor the view that he went to Hades proper, the uncomfortable place, the abode of the rich man. Granted he went to this place, and granted also that he preached the gospel to the spirits in this “place of torment” in order to give them a last chance to secure their salvation, then again we would be in contradiction to Christ’s express statements, who quotes Abraham as saying :

“And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf (χάσμα μέγα) fixed, that they who would pass from hence to you may not be able, and that none may cross over from thence to us.”

In other words: there is “no getting out” any more—those that are in Abraham’s bosom remain there for ever, and those that are in Hades proper cannot be transferred any more to Abraham’s bosom! Hence if Christ had indeed preached the “gospel to the spirits in Hades proper” he would have done something which was—to say the least—useless, for he knew that he could not help them! From this it follows that Christ did not and could not have preached the *gospel*, nor did he or could he have gone to Hades proper, the uncomfortable place!

Above we saw that the verb *κηρύσσειν* simply expresses the idea that Christ as the messenger of a higher person, heralded or proclaimed something. This he did immediately after his “being quickened in the spirit”—after having acquired a new (spiritual) life. With his being quickened Christ’s battle against the powers of darkness: death and grave comes to an end. It is the assurance that he has become the victor, the king not only over death but also over life. As such a king over life and death it behoves him

to sit in judgment over the life and death of the spirits in prison—and not only over these, but also over that of all mankind. Christ's heralding—because it cannot be a preaching of the gospel—must therefore express the idea that He as king over life and death has now also the fates with regard to the life and death of the whole of mankind and in particular of the spirits in prison in his hand. He instantly exercises the powers that belong to him: he sits in judgment over the fates of the spirits—he becomes what the Babylonians would call a *mushîm shîmâti*, i. e., “one that determines (and destines and seals) the fates.” As such a *mushîm shîmâti* he is a herald—one that acts for another person. This “other person” is, as we shall see shortly, “the great gods,” or in New Testament language “God the Father.”

Judgment, however, is not passed except in a place especially set aside for this purpose. This place is called here “prison”; as such it is a house, a room in which the spirits are “kept” to await their judgment, and has, therefore, nothing to do with *Hades*. We shall hear more about this room when we come to speak of the Babylonian Ubshugina.

If we sum up our results they would be the following: Christ died: body and soul were separated, this separation lasted for three days! On the third day his body and soul were reunited again: he was quickened in the spirit—acquired a new spiritual (?) life. This took place on early Easter-morning. But not only the quickening occurred at this time but also his “showing or his proclaiming himself as the victor,” and his resurrection. The proclaiming himself as victor took place in a room called “prison,” where the departed spirits were kept, held for judgment. By this heralding the *fates* of the spirits were sealed or determined,—Christ becomes thus a Babylonian *mushîm shîmâti*, i. e., “one who determines the fates,” as such he acts again as “herald,” i. e., as one commissioned by a higher authority, which latter are the gods. After Christ had “determined the fates” of the spirits in prison, he rises. He could and did rise, because he was man. Man again can and does rise because he is part of “nature,” and nature demonstrates to us every year in the spring that “the dead do rise to new life”

—hence as there is a resurrection of *nature*, so there is and was also a Resurrection of Christ!

That this doctrine of the Resurrection cannot have its source in the Old Testament is now admitted by all who made this the subject of a special investigation; see here especially Professor Gunkel's article in *The Monist* for April, 1903, pp. 417-419 and 439-440, where he considers the resurrection of Christ and his descent into Hades, inclining to the belief that these doctrines were brought to Judaism from "a stellar religion in which it was the ideal of the faithful to be snatched away from the transitoriness of the earth and to become like unto the ever-beaming divine stars." And a little further below he says (p. 419): "It is well known that the belief in life after death has long been present in a number of Oriental religions, for example, the Egyptian and the Persian, and that the whole Orient was filled with it at the time of which we are speaking. It is not remarkable that Judaism also finally adopts this belief, but rather is it strange that it resisted the belief so long." Indeed, it is strange that Judaism did resist this belief so long, seeing that the belief in the resurrection existed among the Babylonians as early as the time of Gudea, patesi of Shurpula, at about 3200 B. C.

But some one may say that there are several passages in the Old Testament which *do* show that the Hebrews did believe in a resurrection, quoting especially the familiar passage in Job xix. 25: "I know that my redeemer liveth, etc." Professor Gunkel, when speaking of this passage, remarks quite rightly, all we can gather from this passage is that "Job thinks for a moment of the possibility that God may justify him even after death" (*loc. cit.*, p. 417). On account of the importance of this doctrine it would seem advisable to examine the several passages of the Old Testament more closely and see whether we cannot detect in them at least *some* traces of a belief in a resurrection and a life after death.

The several passages of the Old Testament with regard to a life after death and a possible resurrection may be divided into three classes:<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Conf. for the first two classes especially Cheyne in his *Encyclopædia Biblica* sub "Eschatology," Vol. II., pp. 1340, 1341.

1. Those according to which the "state" after death is a continuation of the life upon the earth. According to this view the dead possess a certain degree of self-consciousness, retain their power of speech and movement,<sup>1</sup> have knowledge, are therefore called ידענים = "knowing ones";<sup>2</sup> they not only know what happens upon the earth, but they also take an interest in the fortunes of their living brethren: "Rachel weeps for her children,"<sup>3</sup>—as if she knew what had happened to the Jews during the time of their captivity; they know the future,<sup>4</sup> whence they were consulted about it by the living. And because this life after death is simply a continuation of the life upon the earth, therefore it is natural to expect that the prophet should wear his garb of distinction, the mantle, even in Sheol.<sup>5</sup> Kings appear here with crowns and sit upon thrones,<sup>6</sup> the uncircumcised retain their foreskin, nations their national garb and customs,<sup>7</sup> old people their gray hair,<sup>8</sup> and those slain with the sword bear forever the tokens of a violent death.<sup>9</sup> Cheyne, no doubt, is right when he calls this view "*the older*." Of a resurrection we hear in these passages not a single word, although they clearly prove that with death life has *not* come to an end.

2. Those that express a *later* idea and are as such *diametrically opposed* to the former. According to these, death is destruction,<sup>10</sup> and destruction is Sheol,<sup>11</sup> or also called (the place of) *violence*,<sup>12</sup> a place out of which "*he that goeth down shall come up no more*,"<sup>13</sup> a place not only where "kings," "counsellors of the earth," and "princes" are to be found, but also where "*the wicked cease from troubling*, and where "*the weary are at rest*," where "*prisoners are at ease together*," "*the small and great are there, and the servant is free from his master*."<sup>14</sup> It is indeed a place for all classes and conditions of men! There "*Abraham knoweth us not, and Israel doth not acknowledge us*,"<sup>15</sup>—the dead therefore have absolutely no knowledge of what is happening or going on upon the earth!

---

<sup>1</sup> Isaiah 14.

<sup>2</sup> Lev. xix. 31.

<sup>3</sup> Jerem. xxxi. 15.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Sam. xxviii. 13–20: Saul and the witch of Endor.

<sup>5</sup> 1 Sam. xxviii. 14.

<sup>6</sup> Is. xiv.

<sup>7</sup> Ezek. xxxii.

<sup>8</sup> Gen. xlii. 38.

<sup>9</sup> Ezek. xxxii. 25.

<sup>10</sup> Job xxviii. 22.

<sup>11</sup> Job xxvi. 6.

<sup>12</sup> ψ cxv. 17.

<sup>13</sup> Job vii. 9.

<sup>14</sup> Job. iii. 14 ff.

<sup>15</sup> Is. lxiii. 16.

Especially important is here the passage in Job xiv. 7 :

“For there is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will  
sprout again,  
And that the tender branch thereof will not cease.  
Though the root thereof was old in the earth  
And the stock thereof die in the ground,  
Yet through the scent of water it will bud  
And put forth boughs like a plant.  
But man dieth, and wasteth away :  
Yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?  
As the waters fail from the sea  
And the river decayeth and drieth up,  
So man lieth down and riseth not :  
Till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake,  
[Nor be roused out of their sleep.]

What a difference between Job and St. Paul! Both employ the same method of reasoning,—but how different are the conclusions reached. For St. Paul it is just the nature which proves conclusively that there is a resurrection, but alas! for Job the tree, though the root thereof was old, and the stock thereof die, will bud again, but man when he dieth will never rise again! Two arguments, though both based upon the phenomena of nature, lead to two diametrically opposed conclusions! And because there is absolutely no hope for man after death, therefore argues Ecclesiastes (ix. 5 ff.) in his pessimistic spirit :

“Eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a merry heart; for God hath already accepted thy works.... Live joyfully with the wife whom thou lovest all the days of the life of thy vanity, which he hath given thee under the sun, all the days of thy vanity: for that is thy portion in life, and in thy labor wherein thou laborest under the sun. Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goeth.”

Dark, very dark is the outlook indeed, which men have ac-



according to this view! No life, no joy, no resurrection after death! With the death everything comes to an end.

3. And yet, there are some passages in the Old Testament which do indeed betray to us a belief in a deliverance out of the grave! All these passages, however, belong to the very latest portions of the whole Old Testament writings. Now it is not necessary to construe with Professor Gunkel (*Monist*, April, 1903, p. 487) such sayings as meaning that "the faithful expects in this connection not the resurrection from the dead, but rather something very different, namely that God will save him in *present danger* and not permit his soul to go down into Sheol (the grave). This explanation might possibly hold good of such passages as:

"God will redeem my soul from the power of Sheol" ( $\psi$  ixl. 15).

"For thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol" ( $\psi$  xvi. 18).

But it never could be applied to  $\psi$  xxxvii. 28:

"For the Lord knoweth judgment  
And forsaketh not the saints  
They are preserved *for ever*  
But the seed of the wicked shall be cut off."

This "for ever" clearly shows that the psalmist not only believed that God could and would preserve the soul of the saints in *present danger* but *continually*, always and always, for ever and ever, unto all eternity.

Meagre and few as these passages are, yet they help us to follow up the path that leads us to the source whence such a view possibly might have been important. These passages, belonging to the latest portions of Hebrew literature, and as such having been written *after* the *Babylonian* captivity, point thus to *Babylonia* as their source.

Quite recently Zimmern, in his K. A. T<sup>8</sup>. p. 638 *et passim*, saw fit to make the statement, "von einer Auferstehungslehre ist bis jetzt wenigstens keine sichere Spur in der babylonischen Litteratur zu finden." That this cannot be maintained any more now I hope to be able to show.

We have seen above<sup>1</sup> that Enlil, the husband of Ninlil, was the "heaven," while his wife was "the earth." This "wife" had in the three lists, transcribed above, different names, among which there was to be found one, viz., *dingir Gá-ra*, i. e., *Muallidtu* or "the one who brings forth,"—a name which is even found in Herodotus i. 131, 199 under the form *Μύλιττα*.<sup>2</sup> In our *Creation-Story*, p. 19, we heard that the wife of Enlil had several names even in the oldest Sumerian inscriptions—such as: (a) *dingir Nin-tu*, i. e., the divine mistress of the TU or "*bringing forth*" (= *alâdu*), therefore she is also called "the mother of the gods"; (b) *dingir Nin-in-si-na*, "the mother of the world (or people), who created the creatures of the world," but especially (c) *dingir Ba-ú*, who as the wife of Enlil becomes thus the *earth*. Now it happens that we read in several inscriptions of Gudea, the patesi of Shirpurla, who lived at about 3200 B. C., of a "wedding" of Nin-Girsu, the god of rain, thunders, and lightnings, and *dingir Ba-ú*.<sup>3</sup> This wedding was celebrated on the *New-Years-day* of the month called *Ezen-dingir Ba-ú*, i. e., "the festival of Bau." The significance of this wedding-celebration becomes at once plain! *It is the fructification of the earth by the rain in consequence of which the earth is made pregnant and brings forth new life.* *Ba-ú* becomes thus not only an *AM* or mother, a *muallidtu*, one "that brings forth," but also a *dingir Nin-din-dug*,<sup>4</sup> a Sumerian name, which when translated into Assyrian would be = *muballitat mîti*,<sup>5</sup> i. e., "the one who quickens the dead." That which she quickens, restores to new life, are "the green things of the earth"

<sup>1</sup> See also C. S. p. 52.

<sup>2</sup> See also Jensen, *Kosm.*, pp. 294, 515. Zimmern, K. A. T<sup>3</sup>. pp. 423, 7; 428, 4.

<sup>3</sup> Gudea, Statue G. II. 1-7; III. 6 v. u: *Ud-zag-mu ezen dingir Ba-ú ni(g)-gal-gish-sa ag-da*; IV. 18.

<sup>4</sup> If Ba-u is able to quicken the *dead*, then, of course, she has the power to "restore to health the sick" also. Cf. Craig, *Relig. Texts*, I. p. 18, 5-6: *dingir Ba-ú mû nam-ti-la shub-ba shag-gig-ga-ge* = *idit* na-da-at shi-pat ba-la(l)-di ana qi-its lib-bi, i. e., "Bau who giveth the salvina of life to the sick heart."

<sup>5</sup> This name is also given to the goddess Gula—a name which was originally only an attribute of Ba-ú, and meaning as such "the great one," *rabîtu*, *shurbûtu*. In the oldest texts Gula appears still used as an attribute, has therefore not the sign for god prefixed to it, see E. B. H. p. 443.

—hence the name *Ba-ú*, i. e., “the giver (*ba*) of *u* = green things.<sup>1</sup> Such a fructification and vivification of the earth can only take place in the spring. Hence during that time which precedes the spring *the earth*<sup>2</sup> as well as *Nin-Girsu must be fruitless, barren, or dead*. The time that precedes the spring is the winter. In *winter* then both “the earth” and the “god of rain and thunder and lightning,” must be dead, must lie in the grave. Now we understand why Gudea records repeatedly in his inscriptions that he built for Nin-Girsu in the temple *É-ninnú-dingir Im-gig-ghu-bar-bar* also a so-called Gi-gunu<sup>3</sup> out of cedar-wood. This Gi-gunu appears in IV. R. 24, 4b<sup>4</sup> not only in parallelism with *É-kur* and with *Arallû*, i. e., the “nether world,” but is called there even the *ashar la naplusi*, i. e., “the place of the not-seeing, i. e., where one does not and cannot see = the place of darkness. Nin-Girsu then dies every year and goes to the Gi-gunu. Here he is during the winter. In winter he is dead: there are no rains, thunders, and lightnings at this time! But in *spring* he is quickened and rises again, this he indicates by his first lightnings and thunders that even at our present times take place in the early spring. As soon as he is quickened, he rises and marries the *mother* earth, i. e., *Ba-ú*: the warm rains of the spring unite themselves with the earth, who becomes pregnant: in consequence of this pregnancy the dead things of the earth are quickened, they rise and new life sprouts! If this wedding could take place in the spring *only*, and if this was at the same time “the New Year’s day,” it follows that already at Gudea’s time or about

---

<sup>1</sup> *ú* in this signification has according to the syllabaries (see Br. List, 6019, 6027) probably the pronunciation SHAM; we ought to read therefore Ba-sham. This latter reading seems to be implied also in Reisner, *Hymnen*, p. 89, 12; 83, 9 (cf. l. 28): *ugun-mu dingir Ba-ú-MU*, where the MU can hardly be taken as a pronoun (= “my”), but where it seems to contain the overhanging vowel = *Ba-sham-mu*.

<sup>2</sup> See here especially the drastic description of the “deadness” of nature while Ishtar (= Innanna, another name for Ba-ú, C. S. p. 20) is in the nether world, i. e., while she is dead, barren, while it is winter: Ishtar’s descent, K. B. VI<sup>1</sup>. p. 86, Rev. 6 ff.

<sup>3</sup> See E. B. H., Index, *sub* buildings, and Gudea, Statue B, V. 15–19; Statue D, II. 7–III. 1.

<sup>4</sup> See Jensen, *Kosm.*, p. 185.

3200 B. C. the year began with the spring, with the first of Nisan, the vernal equinox,<sup>1</sup> and that the wedding of Nin-Girsu and Ba-ú is nothing but a spring festival celebrating the *resurrection of nature to new life!* It is a *Resurrection-festival*.

In view of this fact we now understand why Nin-Girsu should have become the “*god of vegetation*”: he it is, who by his fructification of the earth produces vegetation, he is therefore the “god of the farmers.” That Nin-Girsu was = Ninib has been recognised long ere this. Our investigations,<sup>2</sup> however, force us to abandon the erroneous idea that Ninib was either the South or Summer sun<sup>3</sup> or the East sun.<sup>4</sup> Ninib (because = Nin-Girsu) is the god of storm, rain, lightnings, etc., as such also a god of vegetation,<sup>5</sup> and a god of the farmers.<sup>6</sup> And just as Nin-Girsu quickens the dead, so it is said of Ninib: “Who has been brought down into the nether world, his body thou bringest back again.”<sup>7</sup>

Nin-Girsu was the *ur-sag*, i. e., prime minister of Enlil, and as in the Old Testament the “angel of the lord” was in course of time identified with “the lord,” so was Nin-Girsu, resp. Ninib, with Enlil! So it happened that when the Canaanites had invaded Babylonia and made themselves masters over it, Marduk displaced not only Enlil but also his “prime minister,”—both of whose attributes and functions were now attributed to him (i. e., Marduk).

Marduk’s wife was Tsarpanitum, i. e., “the one who shines (like silver),” as such she was again identified with Ishtar (= Inanna, another name for the wife of Enlil). Now, it is strange to notice that the name Tsarpanitum should have become, according to the folk-etymology, *Zêr-bânîtu*, i. e., “the one who creates, pro-

<sup>1</sup> This is the answer to Zimmer, K. A. T.<sup>3</sup> p. 514.

<sup>2</sup> See also my forthcoming article on Jahveh.

<sup>3</sup> Winckler, *Geschichte Israels*, II., 79.

<sup>4</sup> Jensen, *Kosm.*, p. 457 f.

<sup>5</sup> K. 133 Rev. 20 (A. S. K. T. p. 81): *mit-cha-rish shumi-shu im-bu-u sham-mu* (= ú-mu) *ana shar-ru-ti-shu-nu* = with one consent the plants called his (i. e., Ninib’s) name to a kingship over them.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. here Engar = *ikkaru* = farmer; and *dingir* Engar = *ilu* Ninib. See also above!

<sup>7</sup> King, *Magic*, No. 2, 21: *sha ana arallê shûrudu pagarshu tuterra!*

duces, seed!" That this must have had a reason is, of course, evident! And what is the reason?

The spring-festival of the resurrection of nature, which was conceived to be (at the time of Gudea) a wedding of Nin-Girsu and Ba-ú, was transferred to Marduk who now took the highest place in the Babylonian pantheon,—it became a wedding<sup>1</sup> of Marduk and Tsarpanitu, which wedding likewise took place in the spring, in Nisan. This event was also considered to be a *tabû*<sup>2</sup> or *resurrection* of Marduk and the *beginning* of his "*kingship*"<sup>3</sup> upon earth. These facts alone help us considerably to explain more fully the nature of god Marduk. Marduk begins his *reign*, his *kingship* in the *spring*. What precedes the spring is again the winter. In winter, then, Marduk has no kingship,—he is *powerless*. In the *spring* he *rises*, during the *winter* he must be in the *grave*, must be *dead*. In the spring he "hastens to the brideship," i. e., he weds, he unites himself with Tsarpanitu. The result of this is again that Tsarpanitu becomes a *mother*, is fructified and vivified,—hence the Tsarpanitu becomes a Zêr-bânîtu, as such she *brings forth seed*. This she does because she takes the place of Ba-ú or Ishtar (=Inanna), the *earth*! The earth by wedding Marduk is made to produce the "green things of nature," and Marduk, who causes all this, is therefore called sha mîti bulluṭa irammu,<sup>4</sup> i. e., he "who delights in quickening the dead,"—therefore he has the name bêl balâṭi,<sup>5</sup> "the lord of life." These "*dead*," whom Marduk quickens can therefore be primarily only = "the *dead things of nature*,"<sup>6</sup> but came to include, because man is a part of nature, "mankind" also.

<sup>1</sup> I-chi-ish ana cha-da-ash-shú-tu, i. e., he [*sc.* Marduk] hastened to the brideship. Reisner, *Hymnen*, p. 145, 8.

<sup>2</sup> Neb. VII. 24; Nerigl. I. 35; Jensen, K. B. VI.<sup>1</sup> p. 306; Zimmern, K. A. T.<sup>3</sup> p. 371.

<sup>3</sup> Ir-mu-ú ana sharru-ú-tu, i. e., he sat down for the kingship. Reisner, *loc. cit.*, l. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Zimmern, *Shurpu*, VII. 84.

<sup>5</sup> Zimmern, *Shurpu*, VIII. 71.

<sup>6</sup> Against Zimmern, K. A. T.<sup>3</sup> pp. 373, 639, who thinks that mîti here = Tot-  
kranke, Schwerkranke. But the מֵת never means sick, but *dead only*!

In another place<sup>1</sup> I have shown that Marduk was the god of *light*, —the light considered, however, not as an illuminating power, but as a *life-giving* principle. Marduk, the AMAR-UD, i. e., “the son of the sun,” if he were an illuminator *only*, could never be called “dead” or “powerless” during the winter. The “*rays of the sun*” —for these are Marduk—are *dead* or *powerless* in the winter, because they do not give *warmth*.<sup>2</sup> Marduk, the god of light, becomes thus the god of the *warmth of the spring*,<sup>3</sup> because in the spring, when he is quickened again and rises, when he begins his “kingship” and enters into a wedlock with mother earth, the *rays of the sun become to be felt*,<sup>4</sup>—his power begins, the earth is fructified, brings forth fruit: the *dead things* of the earth are quickened, rise to new life. The fight of Marduk against Tiâmat appears thus as a fight of the light, i. e., the *warmth* (the summer beginning with the spring) against the darkness, i. e., the cold (the winter, chaos, when everything is barren, dead), which fight took place not only “in the beginning” on “the first spring,” but which repeats itself every year and which will go on *ach-ra-tash nîshi la-ba-rish ûmeme*,<sup>5</sup> —for all eternity, for ever and ever. After having overcome his enemy, the winter, and thus made the creation possible, Marduk receives the highest honor which a god can or may receive: he is henceforth called by the *name* of that ancient Sumerian god, viz., *En-lil*, the “king and father of the gods,” the “king of the lands,”<sup>6</sup> as such a “king” he also has the life and death of his people in his hands. He can now determine their fates, he is a *mushîm shî-mâti*.

---

<sup>1</sup> C. S. p. 5 f. = *Monist*, XII., 572; see also Jensen, K. B. VI.<sup>1</sup> p. 563, cf. *ibid.*, p. 562, and Jastrow, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1901, p. 638,—both these scholars have drawn my attention to these places.

<sup>2</sup> This against Jensen, K. B. VI.<sup>1</sup> p. 563.

<sup>3</sup> The idea that Marduk be the god of the early sun either of the day, or of the spring, or “at the beginning” when the world was created, ought now to be given up once for all, seeing that even the originator of the same, Professor Jensen, has himself abandoned it.

<sup>4</sup> In the winter they are *not* felt, although the sun is shining: Marduk is in the grave, is powerless, is dead, and is as such called Nabû! Marduk and Nabû represent thus the two halves of the year: summer and winter!

<sup>5</sup> K. B. VI.<sup>1</sup> p. 36, 10 f.

<sup>6</sup> K. B. VI.<sup>1</sup> p. 36, 13.

This latter point leads us over to another important event which took place in connection with this New Year's festival.

The resurrection of Marduk was celebrated by the people in this way :

Just as Marduk left the nether world—a place within the earth—so his statue left or went out (*atsû*) of the temple Esagil and was wheeled around on a ship<sup>1</sup> in solemn procession (*mashdachû*). This "wheeling around" took place on the most celebrated street in Babylon, the street Ai-ibur-shabum, i. e., probably, "not shall the dark one gain victory."<sup>2</sup> Especially sacred during this festival were the eighth to the tenth day, on which Marduk as the highest and as the spokesman of all the other great gods "determines the fates" of mankind in a place called *Du-azag*, which again was in another called *Ubshugina*. See here especially K. B. III. 2 p. 15 ff. (=Neb. II. 54.):

Du-azag, the "place of the destiners of fate," which is (in) Ub-shu-gin-na, the chamber of fates (= the room where judgment is given!), where at (the time of) the ZAG-MU-KU, the "New-Year," on the eighth (to the) eleventh day the "king of the gods of heaven and earth," the "lord of the gods," takes his abode (= sits down sc. for judgment), and where he, while the gods of heaven and earth reverently listen (?) and stand, doing homage to him, determines a fate of eternal days (to be) the fate of my life.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> That is: the ceremonies connected with this festival were such that went against "the common order of things,"—it was a festival "der ausgelassensten Freude," where everything went "upside down."

<sup>2</sup> Shâbû not = "enemy" as Del. H. W. B. p. 637 wants, see Jensen, K. B. VI.<sup>1</sup> 335. The "dark one" is the "death," "winter," "chaos," "darkness," Tîâmat, etc.

<sup>3</sup> *Du-azag ki-nam-tar-tar-e-ne*  
*sha Ub-shu-(u)gin-na parak shi-ma-a-ti*  
*sha ina ZAG-MU-KU ri-esh sha-at-ti*  
*ûmu VIII<sup>kam</sup> ûmu XI<sup>kam</sup>*  
*dimmer Lugal-dim-me-ir-an-ki-a bêl ili*  
*i-ra-am-mu-u ki-ri-ib-shu*  
*ilâni shu-ut shamê irtsi*  
*pa-al-chi-ish u-ta-ak-ku-shu*  
*ka-am-su in-za-zu mach-ru-ush-shu*  
*shi-ma-at û-um da-er-u-tim*

Du-azag means "bright or holy hill," and *Ubsugina* the "room of the assembling hand"<sup>1</sup>—we have, then, here a larger place within which there is a "hill." On this hill the great gods are assembled and determine under the presidency of Marduk the fates of mankind. Whatever may be the outcome of this *shimtu shimu*, this "determining of fates," Marduk declares it; he appears thus as a "herald" who although the highest god acts only with the consent of the other great gods!

Taking all these facts into consideration, the sequence of the events, connected with this New-Year's festival, has probably to be conceived of as follows:

1. During the winter Marduk is powerless, i. e., dead.
2. In the spring or in Nisan, which is the beginning of the New Year, Marduk enters upon his kingship again, i. e., he acquires new power, *new life*; is *quicken*ed.
3. As soon as he is quickened he rises—his quickening and his resurrection practically fall together.
4. Having thus been quickened and having risen, he unites himself with mother earth.
5. This union makes the earth "give up her dead"—the resurrection of nature is thus conditioned by Marduk's resurrection—if Marduk had not risen, nature (vegetation) could not rise to new life!
6. Marduk as the victor and conqueror of darkness enters in solemn procession the "holy hill" within the "room of the assembling hand" and determines here in the name of all the other great gods the fates of mankind.

This festival of the resurrection of Marduk and that of nature was celebrated every Nisan while the Jews were in the Babylonian captivity. Surely we must suppose that this spring-festival was known to the returning Jews, if we do not want to maintain that they were dead, absolutely dead, to their surroundings. We saw

---

*shi-ma-at ba-la-ti-ia*  
*i-shi-im-mu i-na ki-ir-bi.*

<sup>1</sup> Jensen, *Kosm.*, p. 240, translates this name by "Raum der Versammlung," but in this translation the *shu* is not accounted for.



above that we could detect in the Old Testament at least some meagre relics of a doctrine of the resurrection, which doctrine, however, in the New Testament holds almost the same place as it did in ancient Babylonia.

As Marduk had displaced old Enlil and his messenger, so Christ displaced Marduk. Marduk is the god of light—and Christ is the “light of the world,” he was therefore made to have been born on the 25th of December—the festival of light—when the days begin to lengthen again and thus save the world from falling into utter darkness. Marduk was the light as a “life-giving principle,” he died, and was in the grave during *three* double-months,<sup>1</sup> but rose again in the spring, on the first of Nisan, when he acquired new life, new strength, new power, and entered into a wedlock with mother earth, his wife, i. e., with Tsarpanitum or Ishtar. Christ, too, died, and was put into the grave, where he was for *three* days, but had to rise again on *Easter*—the festival of Ishtar.<sup>2</sup> By his resurrection he demonstrated that he, like Marduk, had overcome the powers of darkness (= the old dragon, the serpent!) and had entered upon his kingly rulership, and thus became the *bêl balâti*, “the lord of life.” Marduk, however, not only rose himself, but *forced* by entering into wedlock with mother earth, this latter *to give up her dead*. Thus also Christ, if he really wanted to show that there began with *his* resurrection also *his kingly rulership* upon earth, *had* to force the earth to give up her dead—therefore it is said<sup>3</sup>:

“And behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, and the earth did quake; and the rocks were rent; and the tombs were opened; and many

---

<sup>1</sup> I. e., during the six months of the winter.

<sup>2</sup> Easter and Ishtar are one and the same word. It has come into the English language from the Germans, who worshipped the goddess *Ostara*. This Ostara was brought to the Germans from the Greeks, among whom the goddess Aphrodite, = Astarte, plays the same rôle as does among the Germans the goddess Ostara. This Aphrodite was called by Herodotus (see above) *Μίλιττα* and thus identified with the Hebrew Ashtoreh, who again is the Semitic-Babylonian Ishtar, and this the Tsarpanitu resp. Innanna or Bau!

<sup>3</sup> Matth. xxvii. 53.

*bodies of the saints* that had fallen asleep *were raised*, and *coming forth out of the tombs* AFTER HIS RESURRECTION<sup>1</sup> they entered into the holy city and appeared unto many !”

This passage proves, more than anything else, that there was transferred to Christ all that originally belonged to Marduk ! Although we hear in these verses of all the circumstances connected with the death of Christ yet it said that “many bodies of the saints were raised, and coming forth out of the tombs *after his resurrection* they entered the holy city ! According to Babylonian ideas there never could come forth the dead out of the earth at the death of Marduk. Matthew wanting to record the terrible earthquake in connection with Christ’s death—an earthquake so terrible that even the graves were opened—feels that it was impossible to say that the “saints” rose while their life-giver was dead—hence he makes the addition “*after his resurrection.*” With Marduk’s resurrection the resurrection of the dead was given, the dead could not rise if Marduk had not risen first—hence Matthew’s statement : the dead rose after *his*, i. e., Christ’s resurrection ! Christ had to rise *first*—if Christ did not rise, then the dead could not rise. Neither could Christ rise alone, the *earth* had to give up her dead ! And what a difference there is between this statement of Matthew and the reasoning of St. Paul ! According to Paul, Christ did rise, because the dead rise, and the dead rise because nature proves it that there is a resurrection every spring. Matthew’s conception of the resurrection of Christ is more in accord with the teachings of the Babylonian religion.

Marduk after his quickening and resurrection enters in solemn *procession* the “holy hill” within the Ubshugina and “determines the fates of mankind.” Christ, too, after his being quickened sets out on a journey to the so-called *φυλακή*, the great “keeping-place.” That this latter cannot be the “nether world” as such, but must be =the Ubshugina, the “room of the assembling hand,” seems evident enough. Christ as well as Marduk were in the nether world while they were *dead*, while lying in the grave, i. e., during the three

<sup>1</sup> καὶ ἐξεληθέντες ἐκ τῶν μνημείων μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν.

double-months of the winter, resp. the *three* days that preceded Christ's quickening. During these days Christ's body was separated from the soul,—the former being in the tomb, the latter continuing to live as an *utukku*, resp. *ekimmu*, i. e.—according to the New Testament *usus loquendi*—as a “spirit.” *After* these three days, i. e., *after* the time of Christ's being in the lower world, he goes to the “prison” not only as a “spirit” but as a “spirit reunited to its body,” i. e., as a *quickened one*. If this “prison” were the “nether world,” we would necessarily have to postulate *two* descents to Hades,—one while he was dead, the other while he was *alive*, quickened. Besides this, if Christ went to the “prison” as a quickened one, and if this latter (the prison) was the nether world, then the question would have to be answered, where was Christ's body, where was his soul during the three days of his death? We see, these difficulties force us to maintain the identity of the “keeping-place” or “prison” with the “room of the assembling hand.” Marduk “determines here the fates of mankind,” and Christ “heralds” something,—that this heralding or preaching could not have been a “proclamation of the *Gospel*,” we saw above; hence the heralding can be only a proclamation of the fates of the “spirits” in prison. Christ appears here like Marduk as one “who determines the fates.” If this be true, then we may also venture to decide the exact nature of the Ubshugina, resp. the prison. The Ubshugina is never identified, as far as I know, with the Babylonian Hades. Taking all the places in consideration where we hear something about the Ubshugina, we may say at the present<sup>1</sup> this much: It is a room in the temple of Marduk. This temple of Marduk called Esagila represents as each and every temple does “the world” or “cosmos,” hence Ubshugina must represent also a cosmic quantity and as such be situated in the Cosmos. In the Ubshugina the Anunnaki are said to live. The Anunnaki, however, play an important rôle in the “judgment” of the departed souls. Hence the Ubshugina is the “place or room in which the souls of the departed are assembled” and where judgment is passed upon

<sup>1</sup> See also my forthcoming article on Jahveh, and cf. Jensen, *Kosmologie*, p. 239 ff.

them. This "judgment" is given by the great gods under the presidency of Marduk, who are therefore likewise assembled in the Ubshugina. While the gods thus "determine" what shall be done with this or that soul, they sit on the Du-azag<sup>1</sup> or "holy hill" which likewise is to be found in the Ubshugina. After the judgment has been passed, the "souls" are dismissed to the nether world proper, where they enjoy, resp. do not enjoy their fates. The Ubshugina, therefore, as well as the "prison," is the *judgment hall* for the departed spirits, and is as such situated likewise in the cosmos, more especially in the earth, and clearly distinct from the nether world.

Christ as well as Marduk, after having overcome the powers of darkness, and thus shown that they have power over life and death, take upon themselves instantly the functions of the *highest judge*, by "determining the fates." But not only this is their only reward: Marduk was made the highest god and called "*En-lil of the gods*," thus practically put at the head of all the other gods, so also Christ,—he was seated

"on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven; angels and authorities and powers—i. e., the whole heavenly world—being made subject unto him" (1 Peter iii. 21).

Our investigations will have shown us, I hope, the following:

The doctrine of the Resurrection was known in Babylonia as early as 3200 B. C., at which time there was celebrated a spring-festival. This spring-festival was a marriage between "the rains of the spring" and "mother earth." In consequence of this marriage the earth became a *mother* and brought forth in due time "the green things of the earth": the vegetation. These "green things of the earth" as well as mother earth and the god of rain were also considered to be "*dead during the winter*,"—Nin-Girsu therefore had a *tomb* or *burial-place*, the *Gi-gunu*, for his abode during the time of his "death." This was again based upon the common phenomena of nature: during the winter there are *no* rains, no thunders, no lightnings,—hence Nin-Girsu must be dead. In the spring, however, with the first rolling of the thunders,<sup>2</sup> the

---

<sup>1</sup> See Jensen, *Kosmologie*, p. 234 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Mathew's statement about the earthquake in connection with the death of

people gathered that Nin-Girsu has been quickened again! Very soon there appeared also the first rains of the spring, who fructified the earth. As Nin-Girsu is not only the god of the thunder and lightning, but also that of the rain, this "raining upon the earth" was considered to be a marriage between the "god of the rain" and the "goddess of the earth." The resurrection of nature has thus two causes: the vivification or quickening of the god of rain (and mother earth) and the marriage relation between Nin-Girsu and Ba-ú. No wonder, then, that even at our present times this latter aspect should play such an important rôle at Easter, the festival of the Ishtar, i. e., the goddess of *love*!

At the time when Marduk was introduced into the Babylonian pantheon, these two aspects, i. e., the quickening and the marriage—were retained, only the *names* of the parties concerned were changed: Nin-Girsu, the god of rain, became Marduk, the god of light, and Ba-ú became Tsarpanitum or Ishtar. Besides these two ancient features there was introduced a *third* one. The new life of the nature was not merely considered to be the result of a *quicken- ing* and a *marriage*, but they were made dependent also upon a *pre- ceding fight*. The Canaanites before they could think of mastering the whole of Babylonia had first of all to *fight*, subdue their ene- mies. Marduk being their god, becomes thus the god who sub- duces his enemies. And as he subdued them once, so he always has and will continue to subdue them for all eternity. Marduk subdued Babylonia, conquered his enemies who lived there before him. With this subjugation the "new life," the new forms and governments of Babylonia were made possible. For these con- quering Canaanites, Babylonia became the "world," κατ' ἐξοχήν, and Marduk their god, κατ' ἐξοχήν. Just as Marduk conquered the ene- mies of Babylonia, so he also *must* have conquered the old, old enemy of the "world,"—the Tiâmat, or chaos; just as with the subjugation of his Babylonian enemies the new life and develop- ment of "Babylonia" were made possible, so also was with his conquering Tiâmat the life and development of the "world." Mar-

---

Christ *ought to have* occurred at his (Christ's) resurrection! Cf. the remarkable addition "*after* his resurrection"!

duk means according to his name AMAR-UD = "son of the sun," and is, therefore, a god of light, hence if he be the *light*, then his enemy can be only the *darkness*. Marduk's fight becomes thus a fight of the *light* against the *darkness*,—after having overcome the darkness the creation of the world is possible. But Marduk is not a "light" because it *illuminates* but because it *warms*, gives *life*, hence his enemy, the darkness, must be the winter! The fight of Marduk and Tiâmat thus repeats itself yearly: it is the fight of the "*rays of the sun*" in the *spring* against the *cold*! The "*rays of the sun*" gain in this fight the victory: the cold, the darkness is overcome, a new order of things is now initiated, the earth is forced to give up her dead, new life sprouts, the resurrection takes place!

Again a change of *names* takes place—but *only* of *names*! Marduk becomes *Christ*, Tiâmat = "*the old serpent, the dragon*," and Tsarpanitum or Ishtar = who? According to analogy, Christ also ought to marry—an idea almost obliterated, but still preserved in allusions to the bride of the lamb, the personification of the Church.

Just as Marduk conquered the primeval dragon, Tiâmat, and created the world, so Christ *had* to create the world; just as Marduk rose as the god of light every spring, and married Ishtar or the earth, and fructified and vivified her, by means of which she *begat children* or *produced new life*, so did Christ because he too is the light. He *did* rise because he was = Marduk. Marduk is the *author* not only of the first creation but of every *new* creation, so is Christ: only *in* and *through* Christ men do rise. Marduk in consequence of his victory over the dragon was exalted, and received the *name* of Enlil, the "*father and god of the gods*," the "*god of heaven and earth*," the *Bêl* or *Lord*, κατ' ἐξοχὴν, so Christ was taken up into the heavens and enthroned on "the right hand of God," for "God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the *name which is above every name* (!); that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is the *Lord*!"<sup>1</sup>

Our Easter-festival is the old, old spring-festival, celebrating the resurrection of nature, made possible by the victory of the spring over the winter. Nature does indeed rise, man is a part of nature, Christ is man, therefore Christ did rise! And the risen Christ is the *Bêl*, the *Lord*!

HUGO RADAU.

CHICAGO.

---

<sup>1</sup> Phil. ii. 9 ff.